DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 205 850 CG 015 341

AUTHOR	Staats, Elmer B.
TITLE	States Are Funding Juvenile Justice Projects That Conform to Legislative Objectives. Report by the Comptroller General of the United States to the Subcommittee on State, Justice, Commerce, the Judiciary and Related Agencies. Committee on Appropriations, United States Senate.
INSTITUTION	Comptroller General of the U.S., Washington, D.C.
SPONS AGENCY	Congress of the U.S., Washington, D.C. Senate Committee on Appropriations.
REPORT NO	GGD-80-40
PUB DATE	7 Mar 80
NOTE	137p.
AVAILABLE FROM	U.S. General Accounting Office, Distribution Section, Room 1518, 441 G Street, N.W., Washington, DC 20548 (Free).
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Adolescents; *Budgets; Delinquency Prevention; *Delinquent Rehabilitation; *Efficiency; *Federal Aid; Operating Expenses; Program Descriptions; Program Evaluation; *Resource Allocation; *State Programs; Youth Programs
IDENTIFIERS	*Juvenile Justice

ABSTRACT

This report discusses the use of funds provided by the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act in California, Florida, Idaho, Michigan, Minnesota, Ohio, and Texas. Objectives of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act are discussed and requirements for states to receive formula grants are reviewed. Observations from project visits are made as to whether: (1) states had either used funds or had firm plans for the money; (2) states funded programs in accordance with specific guidelines; and (3) projects operated as described in grant applications, used funds as budgeted, and did not maintain excessive cash balances. A state-by-state profile of projects is presented; recommendations and agency comments are also included. The appendix contains discussions of project title, sources and uses of funds, project objectives, and results and observations for each of the 80 projects reviewed. (NRB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

CG

ED205850

BY THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL

Report To The Subcommittee On State, Justice, Commerce, The Judiciary And Related Agencies Committee On Appropriations UNITED STATES SENATE

States Are Funding Juvenile Justice Projects That Conform To Legislative Objectives

As a result of controversy over the amount of fiscal year 1980 appropriations for juvenile justice and delinquency prevention programs, GAO reviewed how these funds were used at the State and local level. GAO found that States have generally used funds received or have firm commitments for their use and that the objectives of their programs were in accordance with authorizing legislation. This report also provides detailed analyses of 80 projects.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

CG 015341

UNITED STATES GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE

GGD-80-40
MARCH 7, 1980

COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20548

B-197161

The Honorable Ernest F. Hollings
Chairman, Subcommittee on State,
  Justice, Commerce, the Judiciary,
  and Related Agencies
Committee on Appropriations
United States Senate

Dear Mr. Chairman:

This report, prepared as a result of your request in June 1979, discusses the uses made of funds provided by the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act in seven States. It also contains our comments on each of the 80 projects we visited during our review.

We are sending copies of this report to the Director, Office of Management and Budget, and the Attorney General.

Sincerely yours,

Elmer B. Staats

Comptroller General
of the United States

COMPTROLLER GENERAL'S REPORT
TO SUBCOMMITTEE ON STATE,
JUSTICE, COMMERCE, THE JUDICIARY
AND RELATED AGENCIES,
COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS,
UNITED STATES SENATE

STATES ARE FUNDING JUVENILE JUSTICE PROJECTS THAT CONFORM TO LEGISLATIVE OBJECTIVES

DIGEST

The Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, has provided formula grants to the States to plan for and fund projects in the juvenile justice and delinquency prevention areas. The Chairman, Subcommittee on State, Justice, Commerce, the Judiciary and Related Agencies, Senate Committee on Appropriations, asked GAO to determine how the funds were used.

GAO reviewed the use of funds provided under formula grant programs in the States of California, Florida, Idaho, Michigan, Minnesota, Ohio, and Texas. These seven States had granted 64 percent, and had firm plans or commitments to grant an additional 27 percent, of their awards for fiscal years 1977, 1978, and 1979. Except for Texas, which had not spent about $600,000 of fiscal year 1975 and 1976 awards, the States had returned only minimal amounts of unspent funds to the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration.

To explain a cut in its fiscal year 1980 appropriations request, the Department of Justice provided information on the estimated amount of prior year appropriations that had not been spent. However, to give a clearer picture of the status of unspent funds, it also should have provided other information, such as amounts granted and committed to projects by the States. (See pp. 6 to 11.)

The Attorney General should direct the Administrator, Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, to provide more comprehensive information on the status of juvenile justice funds when recommending future funding levels.

HOW STATES USED THE FUNDS

The seven States had funded programs that were in accordance with the goals and objectives of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act. Many of these programs were to provide services to status offenders--juveniles who have been charged with or have committed offenses that would not be criminal if committed by an adult--so they would not be placed in detention or correctional facilities. Other programs included delinquency prevention, alternative education, and programs to divert juveniles from the formal juvenile justice system.

The seven States funded 488 projects with juvenile justice formula grant funds, of which 303 were operating at the time of GAO's review. GAO visited 80 of these projects in both rural and metropolitan areas. Sixty percent of the projects were started with formula grant funds and most provided services directly to children. (See pp. 15 to 17.) Of the 80 projects visited, all but 3 appeared to be operating generally as described in the grant applications. (See pp. 17 to 19.)

All but 2 of the 80 projects had properly accounted for grant funds and used them for approved purposes. Although GAO did not conduct a complete financial audit, it found that, with two exceptions, projects were able to support the expenditures as being made for approved purposes.

None of the States maintained excessive cash balances at the State level, nor was this a major problem at the regional or project level. However, GAO noted cash balances in excess of anticipated needs at five projects and regional planning units in Ohio and Texas. (See pp. 20 and 21.)

Each of the 80 projects GAO visited is described in appendix I. (See p. 24.)

AGENCY COMMENTS

The Department of Justice concurred with the report's findings and recommendations and outlined corrective actions being taken. Its comments are included as appendix II and are summarized on page 22.

Contents

Page

DIGEST i

CHAPTER

1 INTRODUCTION 1
Objectives of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act 2

2 HOW HAVE THE STATES USED FUNDS PROVIDED BY THE JUVENILE JUSTICE AND DELINQUENCY PREVENTION ACT? 6
States generally used funds received or have firm plans or commitments for their use 6
Programs funded were in accordance with the goals and objectives of the act 12
Conclusions 21
Recommendations 22
Agency comments 22

3 SCOPE OF REVIEW 23

APPENDIX

I Description of projects visited 24

II Agency comments from the Department of Justice 128

ABBREVIATIONS

CETA	Comprehensive Employment and Training Act
GAO	General Accounting Office
HEW	Department of Health, Education, and Welfare
LEAA	Law Enforcement Assistance Administration
TYC	Texas Youth Council

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

By letter dated June 13, 1979, the Chairman, Subcommittee on State, Justice, Commerce, the Judiciary and Related Agencies, Senate Committee on Appropriations, asked us to determine how funds awarded to the States under the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act were being used, and to assess the effectiveness of the programs that were funded. In a subsequent meeting with Subcommittee staff, it was agreed that we would limit our scope to determining the uses made of the funds and whether such uses were consistent with the objectives of the act.

The request resulted because of a controversy over the amount of unspent funds from prior year appropriations. The Department of Justice, in its fiscal year 1980 appropriation request, estimated that about $163 million of funds were unspent from prior year appropriations and requested $50 million for the juvenile justice program, a reduction of 50 percent from fiscal year 1979. 1/ Several States and organizations, however, considered the Department's statement regarding the availability of prior year funds to be erroneous. They stated that prior year funds had been committed and thus were not available for subgranting in fiscal year 1980.

Because of the conflicting information, the Chairman of the Senate Committee on Appropriations directed its investigations staff to conduct an inquiry in March 1979. The investigations staff reviewed State criminal justice planning agencies in Alabama, California, Florida, Illinois, Michigan, New York, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and Texas and interviewed officials of other agencies. The investigations staff's June 1979 report to the Chairman stated that the juvenile justice and delinquency prevention program had laudable objectives and that the nine States contacted appeared to have implemented systematic and meaningful programs aimed at achieving the objectives of the act. The report also noted that the proposed reduction in program funding would severely damage the program, have a significant adverse effect on local jurisdictions' perception of the program, and possibly undermine efforts made to encourage local participation in the program.

1/States generally have two fiscal years to obligate funds following the fiscal year in which the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (LEAA) made the award.

According to the investigations staff, the Department of Justice had not made a convincing case for imposing the proposed funding cut. The staff noted that in proposing the funding reduction, the Department apparently did not give adequate consideration to the newness of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act in comparison to other Justice and Law Enforcement Assistance Administration programs or to the binding nature of commitments which the States had made to spend program funds in the future.

In his June 1979 letter to us, the Subcommittee Chairman noted that time had allowed only a quick survey at the State level and that an analysis below the State level was required to better understand the program. He requested that our study be completed in time for it to be used during deliberations on the fiscal year 1981 appropriation for the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.

OBJECTIVES OF JUVENILE JUSTICE AND DELINQUENCY PREVENTION ACT

The Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act (42 U.S.C. 5601 et seq.) was enacted to provide the necessary resources, leadership, and coordination to

--develop and implement effective methods of preventing and reducing juvenile delinquency;

--develop and conduct effective programs to prevent delinquency, divert juveniles from the traditional juvenile justice system, and provide critically needed alternatives to institutionalization;

--improve the quality of juvenile justice in the United States; and

--increase the capacity of State and local governments and public and private agencies to conduct effective juvenile justice and delinquency prevention and rehabilitation programs and to provide research, evaluation, and training services in the field of juvenile delinquency prevention.

9

Part B of the act authorizes assistance for State and local programs through formula and special emphasis grants. 1/ Formula grants are awarded to States (and territories) either to assist them in planning, establishing, operating, coordinating, and evaluating projects or to provide subgrants and contracts to public and private agencies. These subgrants are for developing more effective education, training, research, prevention, diversion, treatment, and rehabilitation programs in the juvenile area and for programs to improve the juvenile justice system. LEAA allocates grants annually to the States on the basis of relative population under age 18, but no State may receive less than $225,000 and no territory less than $56,250.

Requirements for participation

To receive a formula grant, the State must submit a comprehensive plan to LEAA for approval. In addition to being consistent with certain provisions of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act, the plan must address 21 items enumerated in the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act. Many of these items deal with administrative and fiscal matters, such as the authority of the State planning agency 2/ to implement the plan, the appointment of an advisory group, and the participation of local governments and private agencies in developing the plan. Other items are of a programmatic nature such as including in the plan

--a study of State needs for comprehensive approaches to juvenile delinquency prevention and treatment;

1/Twenty-five percent of the funds appropriated for Part B must be used for special emphasis prevention and treatment grants and contracts. This program is administered directly by the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention and was not included in this review.

2/A State planning agency is an organization established by each State to administer the applicable provisions of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act (42 U.S.C. 3701 *et seq.*). The Justice System Improvement Act of 1979 (Public Law 96-157, 93 Stat. 1167) amended the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act and mandates the establishment of State criminal justice councils to perform functions similar to those previously performed by State planning agencies.

10

--assurances that juveniles alleged to be or found to be delinquent, juveniles charged with or who have committed offenses that would not be criminal if committed by an adult (status offenders), and dependent or neglected children not be detained or confined in any institution in which they have regular contact with incarcerated adults; and

--assurances that status offenders, or such nonoffenders as dependent or neglected children, not be placed in juvenile detention or correctional facilities.

Of the 56 States and territories eligible to receive formula grants under the act, the number actually participating in the program increased from 39 in fiscal year 1975 to 51 in fiscal years 1979 and 1980.

Funding history of the act

Since passage in September 1974, $449 million has been appropriated to carry out the various aspects of the act, of which $278.5 million was for formula grants. The amounts authorized, requested, appropriated, and available for formula grants for each fiscal year are shown on the following page.

11

Fiscal year	Amount authorized	Amount requested	Amount appropriated	Amount available for formula grants
		(Millions)		
1975	$ 75.0	$ 0	$ 25.0	$ 10.600
1976	125.0	9.7	a/49.0	29.050
1977	150.0	10.0	75.0	47.625
1978	150.0	75.0	100.0	b/63.750
1979	175.0	100.0	100.0	63.750
1980	200.0	50.0	100.0	c/63.750
	$875.0	$244.7	$449.0	$278.525

a/Includes transition quarter.

b/Does not include $10,133,000 of special emphasis funds made available to participating States as a supplemental award.

c/As of November 13, 1979, $23,192,500 of the fiscal year 1980 formula grant money had been awarded to the States. The remainder will be awarded as 1980 plans are approved.

CHAPTER 2

HOW HAVE THE STATES USED FUNDS PROVIDED BY THE JUVENILE JUSTICE AND DELINQUENCY PREVENTION ACT?

Our review in seven States--California, Florida, Idaho, Michigan, Minnesota, Ohio, and Texas--and at 80 projects funded with formula grant funds by these States showed that

--the States generally used funds received or had firm plans or commitments for their use;

--the States funded programs in accordance with the goals and objectives of the act;

--projects generally operated as described in the grant applications, had properly accounted for and used grant funds as budgeted in most instances, and generally did not maintain excessive cash balances.

Our observations are discussed in greater detail below.

STATES GENERALLY USED FUNDS RECEIVED OR HAVE FIRM PLANS OR COMMITMENTS FOR THEIR USE

The seven States had subgranted or had firm plans or commitments for all but 9 percent of their fiscal year 1977, 1978, and 1979 funds. 1/ Except for Texas, which had not spent about $600,000 of fiscal year 1975 and 1976 awards, the States had returned only minimal amounts of funds to LEAA.

Amount of reverted funds has been minimal

Fiscal year 1975 and 1976 funds which had not yet been spent generally were not available for subgrant or expenditure. LEAA guidelines allow the State planning agencies and subgrantees 2 fiscal years to obligate funds following the fiscal year in which LEAA makes an award. Fiscal year 1977 funds, for example, would be available for obligation until the end of fiscal year 1979. The subgrantees are allowed an additional 90 days to spend the

---

1/This analysis excludes formula grant awards for the fiscal year 1980 appropriation, as our field work was performed prior to this award.

obligated funds. LEAA extended this period in some years for some of the States we reviewed. However, with the exception of Texas, which had received an extension through December 31, 1979, for $28,000 of fiscal year 1976 funds, none of the fiscal year 1975 or 1976 funds were still available at the time of our review. The amount of fiscal year 1975 and 1976 funds awarded, expended, and reverted to LEAA for the seven States is shown on page 8.

Funds still available for subgrant awards were generally committed

The fiscal year 1977, 1978, and 1979 funds not subgranted or expended were still available for award at the time of our visits to the State planning agencies. The status of funds at the time of our visits is presented in the table on page 9.

	California	Florida	Idaho	Michigan	Minnesota	Ohio	Texas	Total	Percent
Amounts of formula grant awards (FY 75 and 76)	$3,130,000	$995,000	$450,000	$1,533,000	$710,000	$1,763,000	$1,886,000	$10,467,000	100
Less: Amount expended	3,099,639	947,333	442,374	1,481,499	633,600	1,735,514	1,263,475	9,603,434	92
Amount reverted (note a)	30,361	47,667	7,626	51,501	76,400	b/27,486	c/622,525	863,566	8

a/Some of these funds had not been formally reverted, but, according to an LEAA official, are not available for obligation or expenditure unless extended by LEAA.

b/After our audit, Ohio found accounting errors that, when corrected, showed that $4,501 of this had been spent.

c/LEAA extended $28,000 of this amount until December 31, 1979.

	California	Florida	Idaho	Michigan (note a)	Minnesota	Ohio	Texas (note b)	Total	Percent
Amount of formula grant awards (FY 77 to 79, including FY 1978 supplemental)	$17,232,000	$6,100,000	$765,000	$8,173,000	$3,457,000	$9,283,000	$10,801,000	$55,811,000	100
Less:									
Amount subgranted (including planning and administration)	11,375,044	3,866,365	749,981	6,228,484	2,384,600	3,917,103	7,075,230	35,596,807	64
Amount available for subgranting	5,856,956	2,233,635	15,019	1,944,516	1,072,400	5,365,897	3,725,770	20,214,193	36
Less:									
Amount for which State has firm plans or commitments (note c)	4,169,659	2,233,635	15,019	1,944,516	10,000	5,365,897	1,327,024	15,065,750	27
Amount for which State has no firm plans	1,687,297	0	0	0	1,062,400	0	2,398,746	5,148,443	9

a/Michigan subgranted $28,399 more FY 1977 funds than LEAA awarded. In addition, it committed $291,264 more FY 1978 funds than LEAA awarded and has not committed $224,275 of FY 1979 funds. The net result is an overcommitment of $95,388 which will be made up with State funds if necessary. This was done to insure the State uses all LEAA funds. Experience has shown that projects did not use all funds subgranted.

b/Texas subgranted $201,120 more funds than available in FY 1977 so that the total FY 1977 funds would be spent. The State expects this amount to be zero after FY 1977 is closed out because projects have generally not spent their entire subgrant awards.

c/This includes amounts identified and/or approved for specific projects but not awarded as of the dates of our close-out visits to the State planning agencies.

As shown on the previous page, the seven States had subgranted 64 percent of available funds and firmly committed an additional 27 percent of their juvenile justice funds. We included amounts not yet subgranted but firmly committed, because the funds had either been approved for award by the State supervisory body or set aside for specific ongoing or new projects. The States did not consider these funds available for other projects and generally planned to subgrant and spend them before their LEAA award periods ran out. Further comments from each State are shown below.

--California: The entire FY 1979 award was not available until May 1979. In addition, the FY 1978 supplemental award had purposely not been committed pending negotiation between the State planning agency and LEAA over use of funds. 1/ Some of the funds had been approved for projects by the regional planning units but had not yet been processed by the State planning agency.

--Florida: All funds were committed to approved grant proposals included in the annual comprehensive plan. Funds not subgranted were for projects that were planned, but not yet started.

--Idaho: The State planned to use its unawarded fiscal year 1978 and 1979 funds for two continuation projects. The current funding period for these projects had not yet ended. The funds will insure the continuation of the projects until fiscal year 1980 funds become available.

1/At the time of our review, California and LEAA were locked in a dispute over California separation practices. LEAA wanted California to separate all youths under 18 from those 18 and over, but California did not separate all juvenile court commitments under 18 from "youthful criminal offenders" aged 18 through 26. On December 27, 1979, the Administrator of LEAA notified California that funding under the approved fiscal year 1979 formula grant plan would be terminated unless California requested a hearing before an administrative law judge. On January 2, 1980, California requested a formal compliance hearing. Funding will continue until final resolution of this matter.

--Michigan: The State approves funding for the entire project period when first year funding is approved. This assures that projects needing 2- or 3-year funding to accomplish their goals will be completed before Federal funds are depleted. Thus, if Federal funds are reduced in future years, ongoing projects can still be completed. These committed funds are subgranted for 12-month periods.

--Minnesota: The State recently changed its award process so that all awards will be made on January 1 each year. It expected to subgrant the remainder of its available funds, plus some fiscal year 1980 funds, on January 1, 1980, but it had not approved specific projects at the time of our review.

--Ohio: The State had approved project awards for all remaining funds, but, because of the State's award procedures and the projects' award period starting dates, the actual awards were to be issued over the next several months.

--Texas: The State concentrated its fiscal year 1978 and 1979 funds on projects to deinstitutionalize status offenders and there were not enough projects in this area to commit all the funds. State planning agency officials could not convince some local officials to accept the philosophy of handling juvenile problems at the local level instead of through State-operated institutions or programs. In addition, the State did not accept its fiscal year 1978 supplemental award of $620,000 until September 1979. The State planning agency is currently planning projects in new program areas and expects to use all uncommitted funds.

In the fiscal year 1980 appropriation request, the Department of Justice provided information on the estimated amount of prior year appropriations that had not been spent. However, to give a clearer picture of the status of unspent funds, it also should have provided other information, such as amounts subgranted and committed to projects by the States. As indicated above, the seven States had firm plans or commitments for most of the funds and planned to subgrant and spend them before their LEAA award periods expired.

PROGRAMS FUNDED WERE IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE GOALS AND OBJECTIVES OF THE ACT

The seven States included in our review had funded programs that were in accordance with the goals and objectives of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act. Because the act required (as a condition of receiving a formula grant) that within 3 years 1/ status offenders and nonoffenders would not be placed in juvenile detention or correctional facilities, many programs were funded to provide services to status offenders. Other funding areas included prevention, alternative education, and diversion programs. Each State's priorities are discussed below.

- --California: Initially, California's major objective for using formula grant funds was for programs related to the deinstitutionalization of status offenders. In 1978, however, the emphasis for new programs changed to reducing the number of crime-related offenses committed by juveniles. The Director of the State planning agency stated that although deinstitutionalization was still an objective, the emphasis was changed because the State had reported that it had already achieved a deinstitutionalization rate of 85 percent.

- --Florida: The fiscal year 1975 plan stated that Florida intended to utilize formula grant funds exclusively in the prevention and diversion areas. Florida has subsequently established 13 program categories under which formula grant projects are funded:

  - --Education and in-school vocational training.

  - --Employment opportunities and out-of-school vocational training.

  - --Service delivery coordination.

1/The act as passed in 1974 stated "within two years," but the 1977 amendments to the act changed the requirements to "within three years" and allowed the State up to two additional years if it was determined to be in substantial compliance (achieved deinstitutionalization of not less than 75 percent).

--Substance abuse prevention and/or treatment programs.

--Screening and evaluations.

--Diversion.

--Services for juveniles, delinquents, and adjudicated dependents.

--Planning, research, and evaluation.

--Staff development and training.

--Volunteers.

--Prevention.

--Idaho: Idaho's plans for formula grant funds from 1975 through 1979 had many goals and objectives, all of which were in accordance with the mandates of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act. Numerous projects were funded but specific goals or objectives were not emphasized until fiscal year 1979. At that time, deinstitutionalization of status offenders became the priority and these types of projects received the majority of the funding. Deinstitutionalization will also be the priority for fiscal year 1980.

--Michigan: Michigan's programs were in the areas of deinstitutionalization of status offenders, juvenile justice planning, juvenile correctional programs, juvenile pretrial processing, and reduction of juvenile crime potential. Most of the funds went to the latter two categories.

--Minnesota: Officials of the State planning agency believe the community is the most promising place to identify and prevent juvenile delinquency and that institutional programs for status offenders are inappropriate. Also, since 1978, institutionalization of status offenders has been prohibited by Minnesota law. Accordingly, funding priority has been given to projects which provide community-based alternatives to the detention of youth and institutional correctional programs. The projects are often shelter and foster care homes with objectives of lowering the number of youth, particularly status offenders, kept in secure detention. They also emphasize the prevention of unnecessary out-of-home placements of adjudicated juveniles.

- --Ohio: Ohio used its fiscal year 1975 funds for deinstitutionalization of status offenders. Since then, the State planning agency developed other program areas with objectives such as
  - --improving the quality of service delivery to youth through the utilization of planning/coordination agencies and training programs;
  - --enhancing capabilities of providing direct services, on a volunteer basis, to the youth and the youth's family;
  - --facilitating deinstitutionalization of juvenile offenders and nonoffenders through the use of community-based residential facilities and/or treatment programs;
  - --enhancing the ability of correctional institutions to rehabilitate confined youths; and
  - --facilitating family cohesiveness.
- --Texas: Almost all subgrants awarded by the State planning agency were used for projects relating to the deinstitutionalization of status offenders. State planning agency officials said they considered using some of the uncommitted funds for drug abuse and alternative school projects. They believed that, because the State had met the deinstitutionalization mandate of the act, it should consider projects that benefit other juvenile offenders as well as status offenders.

Projects provided various services

Of the 488 projects 1/ the seven States funded with juvenile justice formula grant funds, 303 were still operating at the time of our review. We visited 80 projects in the seven States as follows:

	Number of projects funded	Number operating at time of GAO review	Number visited by GAO
California	113	44	9
Florida	105	70	10
Idaho	30	17	14
Michigan	47	29	11
Minnesota	33	23	8
Ohio	78	63	12
Texas	82	57	16
Total	488	303	80

The projects we visited were from both rural and metropolitan areas and 60 percent were initiated with formula grant funds.

Most projects provided services directly to delinquents, status offenders, and nonoffenders, including counseling, housing, education, employment assistance, and recreation. Residential services, provided by 45 percent of the projects visited, included long-term housing and short-term emergency shelter care facilities. Other project purposes included coordinating youth services, planning and research, and training.

1/This figure excludes grant awards to the State planning agency and units of general local government or combinations thereof for planning and administration of the formula program. The act permits up to 15 percent of the formula grant award to the State to be used for such purposes. Effective October 1, 1978, the amount allowable for such purposes was reduced to 7-1/2 percent of the State's annual allotment. Also effective October 1, 1978, any amount expended or obligated for such purposes must be matched by an equal amount of State or local funds. Also excluded are amounts provided the State advisory group established by the act. Five percent of the States' annual allotment is to be made available to this group.

22

A profile of projects we visited is presented below. A discussion of each project is presented in appendix I.

--California: The projects were generally aimed at providing or coordinating services to meet the specific needs of youth while diverting them from the juvenile justice system and/or reuniting them with their parents. One exception was a project to reduce school truancy and thereby reduce daytime burglaries.

--Florida: The 10 selected projects were aimed at helping children before and after they entered the juvenile justice system. Seven projects provided services directly to children while the others coordinated needed services. The services included counseling, education, substitute parents, mental health analysis, and housing. The coordination projects, which generally encouraged the use of youth service agencies, referred youths to these agencies when needed.

--Idaho: Seven projects reviewed provided short-term residential facilities, three emphasized education, and four dealt with alcohol and drug abuse, care for children of working or neglecting parents, placement of police officers in schools to improve relationiships between them and the students, and coordination of a youth service delivery system. The projects' goals included preventing juvenile delinquency and school drop-outs, reducing crime, and providing alternatives to the detention and institutionalization of children.

--Michigan: Nine of the 11 projects reviewed provided direct services to youth and the others provided technical services for the overall Michigan juvenile justice and delinquency prevention program. All nine projects serving youth provided counseling, five provided temporary housing, two provided educational services, and two provided recreational and cultural services. Most of the direct service projects were targeted toward youth in trouble with the law or in need of a place to live.

--Minnesota: Six of the eight projects reviewed emphasized alternatives to institutionalization and preventing unnecessary out-of-home placement of adjudicated and nonadjudicated juveniles. Three of these projects provided short-term emergency shelter, mostly to runaways. Three others provided services to delinquents needing treatment but not incarceration. These services included counseling and education programs. One project provided legal assistance to children in a statewide effort to ensure due process in juvenile matters. Another project provided intensive services to serious juvenile offenders.

--Ohio: The 12 projects reviewed generally provided or coordinated services to divert children from the juvenile justice system and keep them out of secure facilities. Services included counseling, recreation, housing, and education.

--Texas: Twelve of the 16 projects reviewed attempted to divert juveniles from the formal justice system or from secure detention; 3 provided alternative education to students who were unable or unwilling to comply with traditional methods; and the remaining project trained law enforcement officers, school personnel, and private citizens by offering juvenile delinquency-related courses and developed a juvenile justice library. All except the training project provided services to children, either directly or through contract. These services included counseling, education, housing, psychiatric testing, recreation, and employment.

Projects were generally operating as planned

Of the 80 projects visited, we considered all but 3 to be operating generally as described in the grant application. The projects not providing the services planned are discussed below.

--Florida Network of Youth and Family Services, Tampa: This project intended to develop a statewide network for coordinating youth runaway centers. We could not determine, however, the uses made of the subgrant funds because the available records were incomplete and disorganized, and no one knowledgeable of the subgrants' fiscal aspects was available. Also, an October 1979 State planning agency audit report stated that no cash receipts journal existed during the first

15 months of the project; the method for applying project expenditures to the juvenile justice funds or other fund sources could not be determined; and because much of the supporting documentation for expenditures was kept unorganized in a box, documentation for some expenditures could not be found. According to the acting State planning agency chief, the project had not met its objectives. The acting chief rejected further funding of the project because of management instability and negative project evaluations. Another State official said that the project had been the State's most poorly managed juvenile justice project. That official also said that the State planning agency would attempt to recover any of the project's assets related to Federal grants. (See p. 47.)

--Deinstitutionalization of Status Offenders, Young County, Texas: This project was to divert status offenders from the county jail by providing short-term emergency shelter in foster homes and by providing psychological testing for status offenders. At the time of our visit in October 1979, foster homes did not exist and the last youth had been served in November 1978. Only four youths had been placed in foster homes and two of these were for long-term residential care instead of the short-term emergency shelter provided for in the grant application. In addition, only 9 children had been given psychological testing instead of a projected 99. (See p. 108.)

--Diversion Impact Project, Harris County, Texas: Although this project generally provided the intended services, it was not operating a residential group home as originally budgeted. This home had operated during the first two project years, but the organization that had operated the home during these years decided not to seek a contract for the third year because of past difficulties in receiving timely approval of contracts and reimbursement. (See p. 112.)

In addition to the above three projects, we noted two projects that had encountered problems which, in our opinion, had affected project results:

--Girls Youth Home, Emmett, Idaho: The facility was in terrible condition. The stairway and second floor were littered with debris. Electrical wiring protruded from the ceiling of one room as a result of recent rewiring. The kitchen and utility rooms were dirty and also cluttered with debris. In the backyard, which was supposed to be a recreation area, trees were infested with caterpillars and the yard contained so much dog defecation that it was difficult to walk without stepping in it.

At the time of our visit, no girls were living at the home. Available reports indicated that 47 girls had stayed at the home between October 1977 and June 30, 1979. A project official apologized for the condition of the home at the time of our visit. Another official stated that the condition of the home had improved since our visit, but subsequently attributed some of the problems to remodeling. We did not note any evidence that extensive remodeling was underway. (See p. 62.)

--Fort Hall Youth Home, Fort Hall, Idaho: This project is a residential facility for Indians. On the basis of available documents, it appeared to have provided an alternative method of dealing with delinquent or potential delinquent youth while operating. However, at the time of our visit in October 1979, the facility was closed because of internal problems. The tribal court judge told us that, for want of alternatives, juveniles are now committed to jails. (See p. 52.)

Grant funds generally used for approved purposes and excessive cash balances not maintained

All but two of the projects reviewed had properly accounted for grant funds and used them for approved purposes. This does not imply that we conducted a complete audit of the projects' financial records, but the projects, with the two exceptions discussed below, were able to support expenditures as being made for approved purposes. We found accounting errors at several projects, but these were generally small bookkeeping type errors that were corrected or properly explained when we pointed them out. The exceptions were the (1) Florida Network of Youth and Family Services, for which we could not determine what uses were made of the funds because of the insufficient documentation previously mentioned and (2) the Deinstitutionalization of Status Offenders and Unruly Treatment Project in Ohio, because the project's bookkeeping and monthly financial reports contained erroneous data that prevented us from determining uses made of funds.

None of the seven States maintained excessive cash balances at the State level, nor was this a major problem at the regional planning unit or project level. Cash balances exceeded anticipated needs, however, at five projects (including regional planning units) in Ohio and Texas. The excess balances at each of these projects are explained below.

--Family Crisis Center, Summit County, Ohio: Although this project did not maintain excess cash balances at the project, the regional planning unit, through which project funds flow, held excess cash in interest-bearing accounts. We could not determine the amount of formula funds in this account because they were intermingled with other LEAA funds. However, we were told that more than $30,000 in interest has been earned over a 5-year period. This interest has been used to buy U.S. Treasury notes and as match money for grants. (See p. 92.)

--Diversion and Prevention Through Community Action, Cuyahoga County, Ohio: This project maintained excess cash balances at the regional planning unit and county levels in recent months. The regional planning unit maintained net balances for its juvenile justice projects of $20,345 and $39,152 at the end of June and July 1979, respectively. The county had net month-end balances of $100,180, $78,998, $60,354, and $36,577 for the months of April through July, 1979, respectively. Prior to these months, the balances at the regional planning unit and county were low or they had spent more than the State had given them. (See p. 91.)

--Diversion Impact, Harris County, Texas: This project had excessive grant funds on hand at various times. For example, about $100,000 was on hand at the end of January 1979, and about $86,000 at the end of February 1979, even though the average monthly expenditures were only $18,458 during the second grant year. (See p. 112.)

- Juvenile Diversion and Delinquency Prevention Services, Bowie County, Texas: This project maintained an average cash balance of $2,107 during its first grant year which ended January 31, 1979. The average monthly expenditure during this period was $429. At the end of the project year, the project had to refund $1,114 to the State. (See p. 106.)

- Center for Juvenile Delinquency Prevention, Southwest Texas State University: This project had a balance of over $57,000 for which the project had no planned use. This apparently resulted from overestimating the number of persons to be trained by the project in the first year. We pointed this out to State officials who subsequently recovered all the funds. (See p. 117.)

CONCLUSIONS

The seven States have generally used the funds received or have firm plans or commitments for their use. Further, the programs that the States had funded were in accordance with the goals and objectives of the act. Although some projects had experienced problems, the projects generally were operating as described in the grant applications, properly accounted for grant funds, used the funds for approved budget items, and were not maintaining excessive cash balances.

The level of funding necessary to carry out the objectives and mandates of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act is a matter for determination by the Administration and the Congress. However, we believe LEAA needs to provide more comprehensive information on the status of juvenile justice funds, such as the amounts granted and committed to projects by the States, when recommending future funding levels.

RECOMMENDATIONS

We recommend that the Attorney General direct the Administrator, LEAA, to

--provide more comprehensive information on the status of juvenile justice funds when recommending future funding levels for the program, and

--follow up on the States' efforts to correct the problems we noted during our project visits.

AGENCY COMMENTS

In its letter of February 27, 1980 (see app. II), the Department of Justice expressed agreement with the report's findings and recommendations and outlined steps being taken to address the problems.

Regarding actions taken, the Department noted that the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention

--has requested a verbal report from the States covering obligations, expenditures, and commitments because LEAA has not been able to mandate a formal reporting system;

--has entered into negotiations with the National Criminal Justice Association to promulgate directives to the States, stressing the need for more comprehensive and timely data on the status of formula grant funds; and

--would begin negotiations with the Office of Justice Assistance, Research, and Statistics for the design of a system which captures obligations, expenditures, and commitments of formula grant awards.

With respect to the problems cited at the projects visited, the Department noted that the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention will request the appropriate individual projects and States to review their cash positions and document corrective action taken. The Department also noted that formula grant personnel would make onsite project visits to ensure that remedial action is taken.

CHAPTER 3

SCOPE OF REVIEW

We conducted our review from August 1979 to November 1979 at LEAA headquarters in Washington, D.C., in seven States--California, Florida, Idaho, Michigan, Minnesota, Ohio, and Texas--and at 80 projects in these States. These States were selected in collaboration with the Subcommittee staff and had participated in the program since its inception. Through fiscal year 1979, the States had been awarded $63,087,000 of juvenile justice formula grants, or 29 percent of the total formula grants awarded by LEAA. This does not include $3,191,000 of special emphasis funds awarded to the seven States as a supplemental 1978 award.

Because of completion deadline constraints, we could not perform an indepth analysis of the States' administration of the formula grant program, or of the projects visited. Our review was limited to determining whether the projects were operating as specified in the grant applications and could properly account for the uses made of grant funds. We could not assess the merits of each project or of the State planning agencies' process to determine which projects to fund. We believe, however, that our review was of sufficient scope and depth to provide the Subcommittee with an overview of the program and the types of projects being funded.

30

CALIFORNIA

PROJECT TITLE: Comprehensive Juvenile Justice Program, San Diego

SOURCES AND USES OF FUNDS:

This project, in its second grant period, started with LEAA Parts C and E 1/ funds and had received a subsequent formula grant along with subsequent Parts C and E grants. Formula funds were used for part of the project's overall administrative costs and for a service center. Budgeted funds for the second grant period are shown in the following table.

	Award period (10/78 thru 3/80)
Formula	$ 286,756
Parts C and E	705,510
LEAA Part C (FY 1977)	576,790
State and local	174,340
Total	$1,743,396

PROJECT OBJECTIVES:

This project delivered social services to youth who were previously status offenders and their families to help divert the youth from the juvenile justice system. The project addressed the problems of inadequate residential facilities, recreation, and prevention efforts in the community. These problems were addressed through nine service centers and two residential centers. The centers provided such services as individual and family counseling, community education, and recreation.

RESULTS AND OBSERVATIONS:

Two centers we visited provided the intended services. These two centers had served 2,403 clients as of August 1979. The centers could not show us, however, how many youths have

---

1/The Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, as amended through 1976, provided grants to the States to improve and strengthen law enforcement and criminal justice under Part C and to upgrade correctional programs and facilities under Part E.

been diverted from the juvenile justice system. In a November 1978 evaluation report, the contractor concluded that administration and management of the project was ineffective. The Director, Department of Human Services, disagreed with the evaluation research methods and data collection devices, but he agreed to take corrective action.

CALIFORNIA

PROJECT TITLE: Status Offender Diversion Project--
Turning Point, Riverside

SOURCES AND USES OF FUNDS:

This project, which was in its first year of operation, started with formula funds and had received one grant. After October 1, 1979, the project was expected to be funded entirely with State funds. Formula funds were used for personnel and for home operating expenses. The project's funding history is shown in the following table.

	Award period (7/78 thru 9/79)
Formula	$130,518
Local	14,933
Total	$145,451

PROJECT OBJECTIVES:

The project operated a six-bed crisis resolution home which provided individual and family counseling and long-term housing. The project was to divert status offenders from the juvenile justice system into a community-based service agency. The agency provided services to reduce the number of status offenders referred to the Probation Officer.

RESULTS AND OBSERVATIONS:

The project appeared to be providing the essential services and to have a good working relationship with the schools, public, and private agencies. Project officials could not provide us with quantitative data showing the extent youth have been diverted from the juvenile justice system; however, our review of clients served for 3 months showed that none had entered the formal system after receiving assistance.

CALIFORNIA

PROJECT TITLE: Project Heavy--West L.A., Los Angeles

SOURCES AND USES OF FUNDS:

This project, which was in its third grant period, started with LEAA Part C funds in the first two grant periods and had received one formula grant and two LEAA Part C grants in the third period. Formula funds were budgeted for personnel services, consultant services, and operating expenses. Budgeted funding for the third grant period is shown in the following table.

	Award period (3/79 thru 3/80) (note a)
Formula	$268,951
LEAA Part C	b/359,049
State and local	39,894
Total	$667,894

a/CETA funds of $629,972 were provided for the period 12/77 through 9/80.

b/Includes one FY 1978 and one FY 1979 grant for the same period.

PROJECT OBJECTIVES:

This project was designed to keep delinquent and predelinquent youth out of the formal criminal justice system. It purchased services for youth, such as mental health and job counseling and educational and other services, to meet the specific needs of each youth. One residential center was also provided.

RESULTS AND OBSERVATIONS:

According to a regional planning unit official, major startup problems occurred in the first 2 years before formula funds were awarded. In the third year, the project had addressed the startup problems and was making progress towards meeting its goals and objectives. We determined that over 1,200 children had been served as of September 1979. In addition, a December 1978 monitoring report showed that the service agencies were functioning as they were supposed to.

At the time of our visit, the project had 18 contracts to provide these services and was in the process of contracting with 6 other service agencies. We visited one agency and it appeared to be functioning as intended.

CALIFORNIA

PROJECT TITLE: Reflection Point Runaway Service Center, Sacramento

SOURCES AND USES OF FUNDS:

This project, which was in its second grant period, started with LEAA Part C funds and was awarded a subsequent Part C grant. The last Part C grant was cancelled and replaced with a formula grant during the second grant period. Formula funds were used for salaries, consulting services, and operating expenses. Budgeted funds for the second grant period are shown in the following table.

	Award period (10/78 thru 12/79)
Formula	$144,646
Part C	85,086
State and local	25,506
Total	$255,238

PROJECT OBJECTIVES:

This project was a runaway center which attempted to exclude runaway youth from the juvenile justice system by providing crisis intervention counseling, temporary shelter, referrals to community service agencies, and followup counseling.

RESULTS AND OBSERVATIONS:

An evaluation report for the first year (funded with an LEAA Part C grant) showed that 492 runaways received crisis intervention counseling, 46 clients received followup counseling, and 351 runaways were returned home. The center we visited appeared to provide the intended services.

CALIFORNIA

PROJECT TITLE: School Delinquency Prevention Project, Gilroy

SOURCES AND USES OF FUNDS:

This project, which was in its first year of operation, started with formula funds and had received one grant. Formula funds were used for personnel, consulting services, and related expenses. The project's funding history is shown in the following table.

	Award period (12/78 thru 1/80)
Formula	$56,000
Local match	6,222
Total	$62,222

PROJECT OBJECTIVES:

By reducing truancy at a city high school, the project was intended to reduce daytime burglaries and other crimes and to reduce delinquency at the high school. The project was expected to develop reliable data on the extent of truancy at the high school, find a way to return truants directly to the school, provide counseling for those truants, and provide education about the legal system to high school students.

RESULTS AND OBSERVATIONS:

The project provided services as intended. It was not yet known what effect the project had had on either truancy or delinquency in the area. Although the grant period started on December 1, 1978, the project itself did not start until February 1979 because the State did not approve the project until that time.

CALIFORNIA

PROJECT TITLE: Coordinated Youth Services, Oakland

SOURCES AND USES OF FUNDS:

This project, which was in its second grant period, started with LEAA Part C, State, and local funds and had received subsequent formula and Part C grants. Formula funds were used for personnel, consulting services, and related expenses. Budgeted funds for the second grant period are shown in the following table.

	Award period (10/78 thru 12/79)
Formula	$193,316
LEAA Part C	218,265
State and local	45,787
Total (note a)	$457,368

a/In addition, private, revenue sharing, and CETA funds were used for project services.

PROJECT OBJECTIVES:

The purpose of this project was to coordinate, through area service centers, existing services and fill service gaps of private and public agencies to reduce the frequency and seriousness of juvenile crime. The services provided included recreation, education, work experience, counseling, and employment programs.

RESULTS AND OBSERVATIONS:

Prior to September 1979, one of the project's centers had placed 125 youths in employment and tutored 68. Project officials estimated that 200 to 400 youths would be tutored in September and October after the school year began. The center director said that of the 75 referrals the center received from the city youth department, only 2 were returned to the probation department or had warrants for their rearrest. We could not observe any of the centers' activities because the summer program was closed and the school year had just begun. A September 1979 independent evaluation report stated that the centers were as well situated to deal with the East

Oakland delinquency problem as was generally possible. It stated that the project was composed of a group of highly dedicated workers and that youth and parents who had received services were satisfied with those services. It stated, however, that significant management problems existed at one of the centers and that high staff turnover was experienced at the centers.

CALIFORNIA

PROJECT TITLE: Community-Based Services in Response to AB3121, Orange County

SOURCES AND USES OF FUNDS:

This project, which was in its first grant period, started with formula funds and had received one grant. Formula funds were used for contracted services, which included personnel and related expenses. The project's funding history is shown in the following table.

	Award period (7/77 thru 9/79)
Formula	$266,000
Other (note a)	38,004
Total	$304,004

a/Includes $29,556 from the county.

PROJECT OBJECTIVES:

According to the grant application, the purpose of this project was to reunite children with their families. The Orange County Department of Social Services was to contract with community-based groups to establish and operate three group homes which would provide services to status offenders.

Grant funds were provided to four group home projects--two new private nonprofit organizations and two ongoing Orange County projects funded with LEAA Part C money. We reviewed one of the new nonprofit projects. The stated goals were to meet the emotional, educational, and recreational needs of the youth in the community. In addition to providing a short-term residence, individual, group, and family counseling was provided to the youth.

RESULTS AND OBSERVATIONS:

The project we reviewed served 34 youths from January through September 1979. Ten of the 34 returned to their homes and 4 were still in the project home. The project provided most of the services described in the grant with minor modifications. According to the only monitoring report completed and our observations, most of the case files did not contain individual treatment plans for the clients, as required in the project contract. The project also experienced startup problems due to difficulty in finding a home and obtaining a State license.

The county also experienced delays in administering the overall grant, due in part to a change in the agencies which refer youth to the projects. The first quarterly progress report was not completed until October 31, 1978, for the period July 1977 to October 1978. The State planning agency was notified of problems in preparing the progress reports in December 1978.

CALIFORNIA

PROJECT TITLE: East Palo Alto Youth Services Program, San Mateo County

SOURCES AND USES OF FUNDS:

This project, which was in its third grant period, received LEAA Part C funds in its first two periods and a subsequent formula and an LEAA Part C grant for the third period. Formula funds were budgeted for personnel, consultant services, and related expenses. Budgeted funding sources for the third grant period are shown in the following table.

	Award period (1/79 thru 12/79)
Formula	$ 98,843
LEAA Part C	16,037
State and local (note a)	162,000
CETA	130,000
Private	125,200
Total	$532,080

a/Either in-kind contributions or cash paid directly to service providers.

PROJECT OBJECTIVES:

This project coordinated youth services among public and private agencies, including career development, job placement, counseling, and community activities. Its main components were employment training, diversion, recreation, and cultural arts. Its stated objectives were to prevent and reduce juvenile crime, establish a coordinating body of youth serving agencies, provide services where needed, establish a youth coordinating council, and implement a public awareness program.

RESULTS AND OBSERVATIONS:

According to the second 1979 quarterly progress report, 12 children were placed in educational classes, 107 participated in the project's summer youth employment program, 158 were in another employment and training program, 191 participated in the cultural arts component, 156 were in the recreation program, and 33 were referred to the diversion component which provided 120 hours of direct counseling. Some children may have participated in more than one component. The project reported that area burglaries were down 14 percent in the first quarter of 1979 and 30 percent in the second quarter in relation to the base line period. Also, the coordinating body of youth service agencies had been established. In addition to our observations of several children receiving services, our review of project records showed that over 200 children had been served during 1978 and 1979.

CALIFORNIA

PROJECT TITLE: Rafiki Masaada, San Francisco

SOURCES AND USES OF FUNDS:

This project, which was in its third year of operation, received formula funds in years one and three. Second year funding came from the city and county of San Francisco, Department of Social Services. Formula funds were used for personnel, consulting services, and related expenses. Budgeted funding for years one and three are shown in the following table.

	Award period		
	(1/77 thru 12/77)	(2/79 thru 1/80)	Total
Formula	$103,000	$117,661	$220,661
State and local	11,444	82,979	94,423
Total	$114,444	$200,640	$315,084

PROJECT OBJECTIVES:

The project's purpose was to provide residential placement and supportive services for status offenders to reunite youth with their families. Services included individual and family counseling, youth advocacy, a home for eight children, and two foster homes (only one at the time of our review).

RESULTS AND OBSERVATIONS:

The project served 41 clients between February 1, 1979, and August 31, 1979. Our review of client records showed that 35 percent of these clients were reunited with their families. A monitoring report showed that the project was meeting its objectives except that it was housing an average 5.2 clients, or 65 percent, of capacity instead of its stated objective of 85 percent. The reason for the reduced number of clients seemed to be decreasing referrals from the Juvenile Probation Department. A component of this department provided similar services and competed with the project for referrals. According to the Supervisory Probation Office of the Juvenile Probation Department, referrals have decreased because juveniles coming into the department since February 1979 have not been suited for the project. The project also had monetary startup problems. Even though the last award period started February 1, 1979, the first grant money was not received until June 20, 1979. As a result, the project had to obtain a loan of $37,000. These monetary problems were caused by city and county administrative delays. A city official said that these delays were typical of all LEAA grants because of excessive State planning agency administrative requirements.

FLORIDA

PROJECT TITLE: The Alternative School and Life Style Center, Inverness

SOURCES AND USES OF FUNDS:

The project started in 1977 with formula funds and had received two formula grants. All formula funds were used for the salaries of a teacher and teacher's aide. The project's funding history is shown below.

	Award period		
	(11/77 thru 9/78)	(9/78 thru 8/79)	Total
Formula	$8,857	$16,673	$25,530
Local	984	0	984
Total	$9,841	$16,673	$26,514

PROJECT OBJECTIVES:

The overall objective of the program was to reduce the incidence of suspensions and expulsions from the school system. The students involved in the program were those who had displayed behavior problems and faced suspension. Students attending the alternative school usually brought their assignments and books from the regular school and returned completed work to their regular school. The project's teacher determined when a student could return to regular school. The staff's responsibilities included coordinating the program, developing curriculum design, and counseling to increase each student's personal growth, self-understanding, and maturity.

RESULTS AND OBSERVATIONS:

At the time of our review, the project was operating as planned in the grant application. During the first grant period, six students attended the project, four of which were referred to the Division of Youth Services and two remained in the program. During the second grant period, 45 students attended. Of these, 34 successfully completed the program, 6 attended schools in other districts, 4 dropped out, and 1 was referred to a law enforcement agency. The grant application stated that program results would be measured from statistical reports on the number of suspensions, dropouts, expulsions, referrals from juvenile authorities, and other student reports. None of these reports was maintained. Little or no supporting documentation to indicate project results was available. We used the State's Statistical Report to obtain 1976-77 suspensions and developed our own statistics for 1977-78 suspensions. We found the number of suspensions had increased from 217 in the 1976-77 school year to 462 for the subsequent school year. However, since the project started, the number of expulsions was reduced from 4 during the 1976-77 school year to zero during the 2 subsequent school years.

FLORIDA

PROJECT TITLE: Mental Health Juvenile Court Consultation Project, Winter Haven

SOURCES AND USES OF FUNDS:

The project started in April 1978 and operated with local funds until its formula grant was awarded in November 1978. The project had received only one formula grant. Project funds were used for a consultant's salary and travel expenses. The project's funding history is shown below.

	Award period (10/78 thru 9/79)
Formula	$16,831
Local funds	284
Total	$17,115

PROJECT OBJECTIVES:

The project's primary purpose was to enable a mental health consultant to advise a juvenile judge on disposition of cases. Project goals were to provide mental health information to the court, provide referrals to a mental health center, and educate the court's staff in matters of human behavior and mental health.

The mental health consultant also advised other State and local agencies dealing with the juvenile court, such as the State Attorney's office and the Public Defender's office. The consultant, who was the only project employee, also counseled juveniles in the juvenile justice system.

RESULTS AND OBSERVATIONS:

The project provided services as intended. Programs developed by the project served youth, their families, and court and social service agency personnel. The consultant's time was spent in juvenile court, counseling, and other activities directly related to the project.

FLORIDA

PROJECT TITLE: Youth Advocacy Service, Cocoa

SOURCES AND USES OF FUNDS:

The project began in October 1977 with formula funds and had received two formula grants. Formula funds were spent for personnel, travel, office equipment, and operating expenses. The project's funding history is shown below.

	Award period		
	(10/77 thru 10/78)	(11/78 thru 10/79)	Total
Formula	$12,983	$12,983	$25,966
Local match	1,443	1,443	2,886
Total	$14,426	$14,426	$28,852

PROJECT OBJECTIVES:

Project objectives included referring youth who had problems with traditional service agencies to facilities offering the rehabilitative services needed and identifying and remedying the problems which prevented such services from being provided.

RESULTS AND OBSERVATIONS:

Case files of 50 youths who had been served by the project showed that 33 were with their families or receiving treatment for their problems, 10 were either not receiving treatment or were awaiting release from a State training facility so that they could receive treatment, and 7 had been referred to the project but project personnel had been unable to contact the youth. The project provided services as intended in its grant application. In the first award period, the project's caseworker provided direct services to youth, but at the time of our visit the caseworker located and referred the youth to agencies that were to provide needed services.

FLORIDA

PROJECT TITLE: The Chord, Inc., Fort Lauderdale

SOURCES AND USES OF FUNDS:

The project had been operating for 4 years and had received LEAA Part C funds since it started. In the fourth year the project received a formula grant for personnel and other operating expenses. Budgeted funding sources for the fourth year are shown below.

	Award period (5/79 thru 12/79)
Formula (note a)	$ 22,922
Private (including interest)	42,359
LEAA Part C	37,451
CETA	14,015
School lunch program	1,406
Parent's support	6,040
Total	$124,193

a/Formula funds are for the period shown, other funds are for the year ended June 30, 1979.

PROJECT OBJECTIVES:

The overall goal of this project was to help its female predelinquent and delinquent residents return to their homes, foster homes, or independent living as productive members of the community. Specifically, the project attempted to serve 12 to 16 girls a year, prevent them from committing delinquent acts or status offenses, and help them with school-related problems. The project maintained followup contact with each girl for 2 years after discharge. While in residence, all girls attended study hall and remedial classes at night and local school during the day. They also had to attend group and family therapy sessions.

RESULTS AND OBSERVATIONS:

The project had served 62 girls during its 4-year life. According to a project brochure, 82 percent of its former residents had been successful in the community, their homes, and their lives. Our review of behavioral files for 33 of 54 former residents showed this statement to be accurate for those reviewed. In fact, only two of those reviewed had to be transferred to the State Training School.

FLORIDA

PROJECT TITLE: Child Advocacy Board, West Palm Beach

SOURCES AND USES OF FUNDS:

The project was initiated with formula funds and had received one formula grant. Project funds were used for personnel, professional services, and related expenses. The project's funding history is shown below.

	Award period (8/78 thru 9/79)
Formula	$30,000
Local	3,333
Total	$33,333

PROJECT OBJECTIVES:

This project consisted of a board of 23 members appointed by the Board of County Commissioners to promote the positive growth of children, identify advocacy needs, and take action to satisfy these needs. The project board worked with elected officials and youth service agencies to stimulate institutional changes in juvenile policies and projects. The board was to also address deficiencies in the system and foster cooperation and coordination among units of government and private agencies in the county.

RESULTS AND OBSERVATIONS:

The project coordinator was hired in November 1978 and the board was established in March 1979. So far, the project has been devoted almost entirely to determining the needs of the county. The project operated as described in the grant application, with efforts undertaken in areas such as diversion, health care, prevention, and education.

FLORIDA

PROJECT TITLE: Crosswinds, Runaway Center, Inc., Merritt Island

SOURCES AND USES OF FUNDS:

The project started in September 1976 with HEW and CETA funds and received two formula grants over the last 2 years. Formula funds were spent for personnel, food, and related expenses. Funding sources for the last 2 years are shown below.

	Award period		
	(10/77 thru 9/78)	(10/78 thru 9/79)	Total
Formula	$ 13,537	$ 13,537	$ 27,074
State and local (note a)	4,747	3,471	8,218
LEAA Part C (note a)	8,500	0	8,500
HEW (note a)	65,000	116,787	181,787
CETA (note a)	50,444	40,411	90,855
Total	$142,228	$174,206	$316,434

a/Funding for year ended June 30, 1978, and June 30, 1979 respectively.

PROJECT OBJECTIVES:

This project provided short-term housing for runaways, abused, and dependent youth. The objectives were to provide temporary shelter, individual and family counseling, and referral services to youth. It acted as an alternative to detention and the juvenile justice system.

RESULTS AND OBSERVATIONS:

Overall, the project met its objectives of counseling the children and provided an alternative to detention. Twenty randomly selected files of 843 total client files showed that eight had returned home, three were living with friends, one had returned to school, three were receiving some type of residential service, and five had run away again.

The project, a private nonprofit, had to borrow funds from a bank once and from other project funds once because of late receipt of grant funds. It took from 31 to 45 days for the project to receive funds after the request date. Part of the reason for these delays seemed to be that the State would not release funds to a project if any project in the county was delinquent in their reporting requirements. Thus, this project's request may have been delayed because another project was delinquent. The project's executive director was considering obtaining permission to make drawdowns directly from the State planning agency.

FLORIDA

PROJECT TITLE: Florida Network of Youth and Family Services, Tampa

SOURCES AND USES OF FUNDS:

The project began in 1976 with an LEAA Crime Control Act grant and had received three subsequent formula grants. According to the subgrant applications, formula funds were to be used for personnel, professional/contractual services, and other related costs. However, we could not determine the actual uses made of formula funds because the available records were incomplete and disorganized, and no one knowledgeable of the subgrant's fiscal aspects was available for interview. An October 1979 State planning agency audit report stated that the subgrantee did not maintain a formal system for recording receipts until September 1, 1978, when a cash receipts journal was established and that State auditors were unable to determine the exact method or procedure used in applying expenditures to the formula grants or to other sources of funding. Other funding sources included the National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism and private sources. The FY 1979 grant was awarded for project close-out purposes only. The project's funding history since June 1977 follows.

	Award period			
	(6/77 thru 5/78)	(6/78 thru 5/79)	(6/79 thru 9/79)	Total
Formula	$23,333	$50,000	$11,042	$84,375
Private	2,592	5,556	0	8,148
Total	$25,925	$55,556	$11,042	$92,523

PROJECT OBJECTIVES:

The intent of the Florida Network was to facilitate statewide coordination of runaway center programming. The goals of the project were to be achieved by assisting in implementing runaway center standards, developing effective youth programming systems, developing internal resources among runaway centers to identify specific skills and services, developing leadership at the local and statewide level to effectively address the runaway issue in Florida, and developing a training program for the runaway centers.

RESULTS AND OBSERVATIONS:

While the State planning agency was in the process of terminating the grant, we found that:

--Source documentation in support of expenditures was classified and maintained by object (i.e. rent, travel, consultant, etc.) in the corporate general ledger; however, it was difficult to match the costs with the various activities or funding sources.

--Much of the supporting documentation for expenditures was maintained in a box with no semblance of order.

--According to the acting chief of the State planning agency, the project had not satisfactorily met its grant objectives during the 3 years of LEAA funding.

--Numerous memos and quarterly progress reports indicated the project had many opportunities to correct administrative and programmatic problems but had failed to do so.

--The project had experienced difficulty in its fiscal management, which resulted in penalties of $5,000 being assessed by the IRS.

On July 26, 1979, the acting chief of the State planning agency rejected the Network's 1979 subgrant application on the basis of the project's present status, existing management instability, State evaluations, and the unreasonableness of assuming that continued funding would meet with future success. The Director of the Department of Public Planning and Assistance advised us that the project had been the worst-managed formula grant project in the State. He further stated that the State planning agency would attempt to recover any assets related to Federal grants. According to an audit report, the project had questionable expenditures of $48,878 which had to be resolved to the State planning agency's satisfaction or the funds would be returned to LEAA.

FLORIDA

PROJECT TITLE: Big Brothers/Big Sisters of Greater Gainesville, Gainesville

SOURCES AND USES OF FUNDS:

The project began in September 1975 with United Way and other private sources. The project had received three formula grants over a 2-year period. Formula funds were used for salaries and employee benefits, travel, supplies, and other operating expenses. Project funding for the last three grant periods follows.

	Award period			
	(12/77 thru 9/78)	(10/78 thru 11/78)	(12/78 thru 10/79)	Total
Formula	$18,970	$3,437	$16,835	$39,242
Private	a/$19,025		b/20,061	39,086
Total	$41,432		$36,896	$78,328

a/Actual expenses.

b/Actual expenses, January 1979 thru October 1979.

PROJECT OBJECTIVES:

The project's primary goal was to match single-parent children with volunteer adults who were to provide companionship, support, concern, and an adult role model for the child. Some of these children were considered to be at a high risk of becoming delinquent. The project evaluated a child's needs, referred the child to other service agencies when necessary, and counseled and supervised the adult/child pairs. The project attempted to reduce delinquency by providing a positive adult role model to improve the child's self-concept and attitude toward authority figures.

RESULTS AND OBSERVATIONS:

From the beginning of the initial grant through July 12, 1979, the project had processed 53 referrals and had matched 23 children with volunteers. Volunteers had been recruited, oriented, and trained. On the basis of our observations, the project appeared to provide the required services.

FLORIDA

PROJECT TITLE: Individual Assistance Program, Tampa

SOURCES AND USES OF FUNDS:

The project was operated by the Boy's Club of Greater Tampa. Although the Boy's Club provided services similar to the project before receiving the two formula grants, those funds made it possible for an employee to operate the project on a full-time basis. Formula funds were used for personnel, travel, equipment, and operating expenses. Budgeted funding for the two grant periods are shown below.

	Award period		
	(2/78 thru 1/79)	(2/79 thru 1/80)	Total
Formula	$14,785	$11,828	$26,613
Private	1,643	0	1,643
Total	$16,428	$11,828	$28,256

PROJECT OBJECTIVES:

This project was designed to provide a diversion alternative to the juvenile justice system. Children who had committed an offense were to be diverted to the project before adjudication. The objective was to help the boys deal with their problems before they committed additional offenses. The project provided individual and group counseling and attempted to integrate the boys into the regular Boy's Club activities. These activities included recreational, educational, vocational, and cultural activities and a full range of sports activities.

RESULTS AND OBSERVATIONS:

The facilities at the three branches of the project visited were in excellent shape and capable of providing the required services. At the time of our visit, 127 boys had been accepted in the program, of whom 125 were integrated into the regular club activities. Of these, 10 were referred to the Florida Department of Health and Rehabilitative Service for subsequent behavior problems.

FLORIDA

PROJECT TITLE: Youth Resources Bureau, Jacksonville

SOURCES AND USES OF FUNDS:

The project began in 1974 with LEAA Crime Control Act funds. It received two subsequent formula grants. Formula funds were used for salaries, travel, professional services, and other operating expenses. The project's funding sources for the two grant periods are shown below.

	Award period		
	(6/77 thru 8/77)	(2/79 thru 11/79)	Total
Formula	$24,883	$68,245	$ 93,128
Local	2,765	29,248	32,013
Total	$27,648	$97,493	$125,141

PROJECT OBJECTIVES:

The project's goals were to help youth become more self-reliant through problem-solving and keeping them out of the juvenile justice system. The project served as a coordinated, comprehensive mechanism by which dysfunctional youth, who had not been, but were inclined to be referred to the formal juvenile justice system, were identified and provided prescriptive service(s). A dysfunctional youth was defined as a youth who was referred to intake staff of the Division of Youth Services but on whom no petition was filed or a youth who had not been referred to the juvenile justice system but who may be if intervention/prevention measures were not taken.

Prescriptive services were provided by augmenting existing community resources and developing additional programs. Professional services, such as medical, psychological, and long-term counseling were available through competitive and noncompetitive contracts.

RESULTS AND OBSERVATIONS:

The project operated as stated in the grant application and all expenditures were for approved purposes. The fiscal and programmatic management control systems seemed adequate. The project was the only agency in Jacksonville that served youth prior to adjudication. At the time of our visit, this project was in its fifth year of funding with no firm commitment from the city for continued operation.

IDAHO

PROJECT TITLE: Fort Hall Youth Home, Fort Hall

SOURCES AND USES OF FUNDS:

The project began with formula funds in 1977 and received two formula grants. Project funds were used for personnel, facilities, and related expenses. The project's funding history is shown below.

	Award period		
	(5/77 thru 6/78)	(6/78 thru 9/79)	Total
Formula	$73,437	$57,143	$130,580
Tribal Council	0	37,393	37,393
Total	$73,437	$94,536	$167,973

PROJECT OBJECTIVES:

This was a diversion project to embody new methods and techniques compatible with the traditional ways of Indian people. Its goals were to divert delinquents or potential delinquents from engaging in illegal behavior, involve more Native Americans in tribal youth programs, focus on the family when intervention was necessary, and train parents to become more involved in their children's lives. The project was to provide various services, including psychological testing; residential care; family, individual, and group counseling; and academic tutoring.

RESULTS AND OBSERVATIONS:

After discussing this project with State planning agency officials, we expected it to be operating when we visited it in October 1979. Upon our arrival, however, a member of the tribal council told us the project home was closed on September 28, 1979, when it ran out of money. Local officials said the project director was fired a month earlier because of questionable overtime payments, internal problems, and late progress reports. The tribal court judge said juveniles are now committed to jail for lack of alternatives. A project document showed that 101 children were served at the home in calendar year 1978. In addition, the staff worked with 64 youths on an outpatient basis. Because of the project director's dismissal, results for 1979 were not available.

IDAHO

PROJECT TITLE: Juvenile Delinquency Prevention, Pocatello

SOURCES AND USES OF FUNDS:

The project began in 1977 with formula funds and was funded in its second year with an LEAA Part C grant. Formula funds were again used for the project's third year of operation to pay for personnel, supplies, and related expenses. Project funding for the first and third grant periods is shown below.

	Award period		
	(3/77 thru 6/78)	(7/79 thru 6/80)	Total
Formula	$22,079	$11,163	$33,242
Local	6,576	22,831	29,407
Total	$28,655	$33,994	$62,649

PROJECT OBJECTIVES:

Project goals were to establish a Youth Services Bureau in the police department and to develop a coordinated youth service delivery system by using the available services and agencies in the community. The project tried to fill service gaps within the community delinquency prevention and control program. The youth service specialist provided such services as coordinating educational, recreational, social, and legal agencies in delinquency prevention efforts; assisting in a program of uniformed officers in elementary schools; becoming involved in screening and diverting juvenile offenders; acting as a liaison between the city, other units of government, and social agencies; and assisting other agencies in drawing proposals and writing grant applications.

RESULTS AND OBSERVATIONS:

The project appeared to have accomplished its objectives. The youth service specialist helped establish several juvenile services in the community and diverted 203 of 443 youth charged with misdemeanors or status offenses. The specialist recently initiated action to secure a grant that would provide shelter, counseling, and after-care to runaways and homeless youth. A State planning agency official, describing the project as excellent, said the detention of status offenders had been reduced.

IDAHO

PROJECT TITLE: Creating Dropout Alternatives, Coeur d'Alene

SOURCES AND USES OF FUNDS:

This project started with a 1-month formula grant and received two subsequent grants. Formula funds were used for personnel, consultants' fees, evaluation tests, and related expenses. The project's funding history is shown below.

	Award period			
	(6/78 thru 7/78)	(7/78 thru 6/79)	(7/79 thru 6/80)	Total
Formula	$11,132	$29,354	$36,000	$ 76,486
State liquor tax	0	10,259	4,000	14,259
Local	0	9,750	20,000	29,750
Total	$11,132	$49,363	$60,000	$120,495

PROJECT OBJECTIVES:

The project's basic goals were to prevent delinquency and prevent students from dropping out of high school. The project provided a special school program for potential dropouts. For one-half of the day the youth attended classes, and for the other half they were employed by local businesses in career-type positions. The project was staffed with a director and two teachers. The school curriculum was specialized for each individual and aimed at increasing participants' basic skills to an appropriate level.

RESULTS AND OBSERVATIONS:

The project served 58 juveniles in its first year and 48 juveniles participated in the project at the time of our visit. A State monitoring report stated that twice as many students were in the program as originally anticipated and that no deficiencies were found. Of the first year participants, 10 graduated, 31 were participating in the project, 5 had returned to high school, 1 went half day to high school and half day in the project, 4 dropped out of the program, and 7 had moved from the area.

IDAHO

PROJECT TITLE: Remedial Education and Adjustment for Delinquent Youth, Lewiston

SOURCES AND USES OF FUNDS:

This project, which was in its third year of operation, was started with private funds. It received a formula grant for the second year and an LEAA Part C grant for the third year. The formula funds were used for personnel, consultants, and related expenses. Funding sources for the second year are shown below.

	Award period (9/77 thru 12/78)
Formula	$43,274
Local	10,000
Total	$53,274

PROJECT OBJECTIVES:

The project was an alternative education program to aid delinquent youth. It operated on a State college campus in a facility which had four classrooms and an administrative office. The project's objectives were to treat delinquent youths' educational and behavioral disabilities, show that delinquent youth make significant educational gains when given proper attention, and eventually return delinquent youth to their community schools. The project was staffed with 12 people which included 4 teachers and 4 teachers' aides.

RESULTS AND OBSERVATIONS:

Fifty-seven students had participated in the project since Federal funding began (September 1977). Twenty of the 57 students failed the program and were referred to other youth service facilities. Of the students who completed the program, 53 percent returned to a public school for at least one semester, 30 percent were employed, 14 percent were in a vocational program, and 3 percent had an unknown status.

This project had been visited by various people and groups interested in its program, including a State commission on mental health. The State planning agency recommended the project for "exemplary project" status, and it had been recommended that the State agency finance the training of other State teachers by the project's staff.

IDAHO

PROJECT TITLE: Foster Care Program Coordinator, Ada County

SOURCES AND USES OF FUNDS:

This project was started with formula funds in order to better administer a special emphasis grant for payments to foster parents. The formula funds were budgeted for personnel, a vehicle, and related expenses. The project's funding history is shown below.

	Award period (12/78 thru 11/79)
Formula	$22,338
State liquor tax	2,483
Total	$24,821

PROJECT OBJECTIVES:

Project objectives were to coordinate foster care services for status offenders in the county and to reduce the number of status offenders presently housed in detention facilities. The coordinator, who was the project's only employee, recruited foster care families and made sure their qualifications met standards for proper licensing through the State Department of Health and Welfare. The coordinator also authorized payments to foster parents.

RESULTS AND OBSERVATIONS:

From December 1978 through May 1979, the project was unsuccessful in that few foster homes had been licensed. In March 1979, only three foster homes were licensed. Status offenders were detained in a county facility, possibly due to the lack of foster care facilities. On May 9, 1979, it was decided that a new implementing agency should take control of the project. Since the change occurred in June 1979, a new coordinator had been hired, 10 foster homes had been licensed, and status offenders were being diverted from detention facilities.

IDAHO

PROJECT TITLE: Quad County Youth Shelter Home, Payette

SOURCES AND USES OF FUNDS:

This project was financed in its first year with an LEAA Crime Control Act grant, followed by 2 years of partial funding with formula grants. It was subsequently funded by the four counties whose area it served. Formula funds were used for personnel, consultant fees, facilities, and related expenses. Budgeted funding sources for years two and three are shown in the following table.

	Award period		
	(1/77 thru 12/77)	(1/78 thru 12/78)	Total
Formula	$12,000	$ 6,000	$18,000
Local match	12,000	18,489	30,489
Project income	10,544	10,055	20,599
Total	$34,544	$34,544	$69,088

PROJECT OBJECTIVES:

The project's goals were to reduce the number of days spent in jail by youth, reduce the recidivism rate for boys in a four-county area, and reduce the number of youth placed in facilities outside the area. Services provided by the project were short-term residential care, partial care (less than 24 hours) for assessment and treatment of problems, and the establishment of community-based programs to develop shelter care homes, halfway houses, and other services. The project was staffed with full time and part time houseparents.

RESULTS AND OBSERVATIONS:

The home's condition and living environment was very good. The shelter home provided live-in facilities for six boys, and two were in residence during our visit. During calendar year 1978, 36 males were placed in the facility. The 36 included nonoffenders, status offenders, and delinquents. The project was providing the intended services.

IDAHO

PROJECT TITLE: Psychological Services of Idaho, Inc., Boise

SOURCES AND USES OF FUNDS:

This project was started in March 1976 with private funds and received LEAA Crime Control Act funds in 1977. Formula funds were received for the second federally funded year in October 1978. Formula funds were used for personnel, facilities, and related expenses. Budgeted funding sources for the second year are shown below.

	Award period (10/78 thru 9/79)
Formula	$34,113
Local match	11,665
Program income	44,119
Total	$89,897

PROJECT OBJECTIVES:

The project leased two homes, one which housed eight girls and the other six boys. It provided meals, personal and vocational counseling, medical care, and other services to youth. The project's objective was to provide short-term residential care and counseling to status offenders. The project was staffed by an overall manager, two house managers, and two assistant house managers.

RESULTS AND OBSERVATIONS:

From July 1978 through June 1979, 166 youths were placed in the 2 homes. Five boys and six girls were at the homes during our visit. Our observation of the facilities and juveniles indicated shelter care and related social services were being provided.

IDAHO

PROJECT TITLE: Emergency Shelter Home and Referral Program, Kootenai County

SOURCES AND USES OF FUNDS:

This project was started with formula funds and was subsequently funded with an LEAA Part C grant. Formula funds were used for personnel and related expenses. Budgeted funding sources for the first year are shown below.

	Award period (4/78 thru 3/79)
Formula	$19,412
Private	5,775
Total	$25,187

PROJECT OBJECTIVES:

The project's objectives were to (1) secure six to eight emergency shelter care facilities and (2) provide short-term care and supervision, long-term counseling, and refer youth to other service agencies. Prior to the project, there were few formal juvenile delinquency programs and no systematic alternative to detention of status offenders in the county.

RESULTS AND OBSERVATIONS:

Our review indicated that all the above services were offered by the project. The final progress report showed that 23 juveniles were placed in emergency foster homes and 38 participated in the long-term counseling program between July 1978 and April 1979. However, the number of juveniles participating in the project was less than anticipated. Project and State officials stated that more juveniles could have been placed in foster homes if juvenile magistrates would have referred status offenders to the project. The magistrates had been sending status offenders to secure detention.

IDAHO

PROJECT TITLE: School Resource Officers, Lewiston

SOURCES AND USES OF FUNDS:

The first School Resource Officer program was developed by the police department in 1972. The current project, which received LEAA Part C and local funds in its first 2 years, received a formula grant for the third year. The city of Lewiston had totally funded the project since completion (December 1977) of the formula grant. Formula funds were used to pay the officers' salaries. Budgeted funding sources for the third project year are shown below.

	Award period (1/77 thru 12/77)
Formula	$ 6,555
Local	19,665
Total	$26,220

PROJECT OBJECTIVES:

The project was to place trained police officers in the city school system. Project officials anticipated that doing so would create better understanding and relationships between police and juveniles and would eventually reduce juvenile crime. The police officers were to work in the city's junior high and elementary schools and conduct group discussions, provide safety information and information about the juvenile justice system, and aid and counsel youth and their families.

RESULTS AND OBSERVATIONS:

During the grant period, the officers contacted juveniles at seven elementary and two junior high schools in the city. All the students from each school were served, and services as described in the grant award were provided. The police department attributed the 33 percent drop in juvenile arrests between 1975 and 1977 to the project.

IDAHO

PROJECT TITLE: Prospect House, Lewiston

SOURCES AND USES OF FUNDS:

This project, which started with an LEAA Part C grant, received a formula grant for its second year and was subsequently funded by the States of Idaho and Washington and private sources. Formula funds were used for personnel and related expenses. Budgeted funding sources for the second year are shown below.

	Award period (9/77 thru 8/78)
Formula	$17,163
Local match	1,908
Project income	36,945
Total	$56,016

PROJECT OBJECTIVES:

The project's objective was to help girls solve their problems and re-enter their communities, whether they lived in a foster home, their parents' home, or had reached the age of emancipation. The project provided residential services for a maximum of six girls at one time. Social and educational services were also provided. The project was staffed by a program coordinator and three counselors.

RESULTS AND OBSERVATIONS:

The project received 17 referrals since it began. Of the 17, 4 were still in the home, 2 were evicted from the home, 1 had reached the age of emancipation, and the others seemed to have been successfully placed. The project provided services as intended.

IDAHO

PROJECT TITLE: Girl's Youth Home, Emmett

SOURCES AND USES OF FUNDS:

The project started with State and local government and private sources approximately 5-1/2 years ago. Since then, the project received one LEAA Part C grant and then two formula grants for the past 2 years. Formula funds were used for personnel, equipment, and related expenses. The project's funding for the last 2 years follows.

	Award period		
	(10/77 thru 9/78)	(10/78 thru 9/79)	Total
Formula	$11,144	$ 9,311	$20,455
Project income	7,500	7,500	15,000
Donations	3,764	2,690	6,454
Local	0	6,049	6,049
Total	$22,408	$25,550	$47,958

PROJECT OBJECTIVES:

This project's purpose was to provide an alternative to incarceration of female juveniles. The project provided shelter, residential care, and staff to help the girls to improve their behavior and home life. Emphasis was placed on making the girls responsible and independent. The court approved the project home as an acceptable alternative to jail.

RESULTS AND OBSERVATIONS:

At the time of our visit, the home, backyard, and shed were in horrible condition. The stairway and entire second floor were littered with debris. One bedroom contained several dirty mattresses piled up. In another room, electrical wiring protruded from the ceiling as a result of recent rewiring. The kitchen and utility rooms were dirty and cluttered with debris. At the time of our visit, no girls were living at the home.

The backyard was supposedly a recreation area. We noticed that large trees were infested with catepillars and that the yard contained so much dog defecation that it was difficult to walk without stepping in it. The shed was supposedly used as a ceramic workshop. In it were a kiln and pottery-forming machinery that had not been used. Also, several of the houseparent's personal items cluttered the entire shed. The facility's condition was not conducive to good living environment or for carrying out the project objectives successfully.

Available reports showed that 47 girls had used the home between October 1977 and June 30, 1979. A project official said it was difficult to determine what happened to them after they left and that no statistics were available on this.

A project official said that the information in our summary was correct and apologized for the condition of the home at the time of our visit. Another project official only stated that the condition of the home had improved since our visit but, about 3 months later, we received correspondence from this individual indicating that many of the problems we noted in the upstairs and kitchen areas were due to remodeling.

At the time of our visit, we did not note any evidence that extensive remodeling was underway. Moreover, a progress report prepared for the State planning agency over a month prior to our visit stated that many of the improvements cited by the official as being underway had already been completed.

IDAHO

PROJECT TITLE: National Youth Project Using Minibikes, Coeur d'Alene

SOURCES AND USES OF FUNDS:

The project began with formula funds in 1977. It had received two formula grants which were used for personnel, facilities, and related expenses. Minibikes used in the project were donated, but maintenance and insurance for the minibikes were paid for with formula funds. The project's funding history follows.

	Award period		
	(3/77 thru 2/78)	(11/78 thru 11/79)	Total
Formula	$10,477	$ 7,000	$17,477
Private	3,492	7,000	10,492
Total	$13,969	$14,000	$27,969

PROJECT OBJECTIVES:

This project used minibikes to hold the attention of delinquent or delinquently prone youth while services were provided. The objectives included diverting youth from the juvenile justice system, reducing recidivism, improving school performance, and increasing community involvement. The project consisted of discussing the participants' behavioral problems, teaching them to ride minibikes, counseling, and developing a program for their special interests.

RESULTS AND OBSERVATIONS:

Project officials said the project had had continued staff turnover and transportation problems since inception, resulting in program inconsistency and the inability to meet project objectives. During the first year, 47 children were served. No other results were available for that year except that no participants were arrested during the grant period. During the second year, 16 youths participated; however, the project had three different directors, and three of four volunteer tutors quit. Also, an evaluation showed that the project was not getting referrals from local law enforcement agencies and transportation was needed for youth in outlying areas. An evaluation of the participants also showed that school performance had not improved. Additionally, the project had not been well received by the community.

IDAHO

PROJECT TITLE: Summer Youth Alternative Project, Pocatello

SOURCES AND USES OF FUNDS:

The project was funded from private sources during its first year. It received two formula grants during years two and three. Formula funds were for personnel, transportation, and related expenses. The project's funding history for its second and third year follows.

	Award period		
	(3/78 thru 8/78)	(3/79 thru 9/79)	Total
Formula	$ 5,626	$ 5,086	$ 10,712
Tuition	43,200	43,200	86,400
U.S. Dept. of Agriculture	19,186	19,186	38,372
Private and match	2,357	3,266	5,623
Total	$70,369	$70,738	$141,107

PROJECT OBJECTIVES:

This project provided care during the summer months to children of working or neglectful parents. Its goals and objectives included decreasing the number of complaints made against the 6- to 12-year age group while they were unattended, providing alternatives to parental neglect and delinquent behavior, providing followup social services to the families of delinquency prone children, and using delinquent teenagers as aides. In addition to daily care and housing, the project provided field trips to help the children become active participants in community activities. The children also participated in games and creative activities.

RESULTS AND OBSERVATIONS:

Although the summer program was completed before our visit, we were shown slides of the previous summer's activities. A total of 426 children participated in the 1978 and 1979 programs. The State Department of Health and Welfare referred 87 of these juveniles during the first year and an estimated 90 during the second year. The referred juveniles were judged to be in the "high risk juvenile delinquency" category.

IDAHO

PROJECT TITLE: Drug Prevention, Diversion, and Development for Juveniles, Idaho Falls

SOURCES AND USES OF FUNDS:

The project was initially funded with an LEAA Part C grant. It received a formula grant for its second year of operation, and for its third year it was again funded by an LEAA Part C grant. Project funds were used for personnel, consultants, facilities, and related expenses. The amount of formula and local funds for the second year of the project are shown below.

	Award period (7/78 thru 6/79)
Formula	$25,655
Local funds	25,655
Total	$51,310

PROJECT OBJECTIVES:

This project added a drug and alcohol prevention program to a consortium of agencies which already provided similar services to adults. The primary goal was to reduce the number of alcohol and drug related offenses committed by juveniles. The project provided the following services: drug and alcohol education; group therapy; individualized tutoring; learning disability diagnosis; individual treatment plans; and vocational guidance, training, and job placement.

RESULTS AND OBSERVATIONS:

Our review of agency records and interviews with agency and public officials revealed mixed opinions about the project. A project official said activities were being carried out as described in the grant award and objectives were being met. Others, however, said that some of the services provided needed to be strengthened. For example, we were told that the counseling and diversion program was somewhat successful, but the prevention program of alcohol and drug education in the schools had had little effect. A 1978 summer youth program, where high-risk juveniles were taught basic life skills, appeared to be successful. However, this program was not continued in 1979 because its costs were high, only a few juveniles could participate, and it was "an administrative nightmare."

Pre- and posttreatment behavior was studied for 60 youths by measuring drug use, legal involvement, and school attendance. The results showed (1) an increase in both alcohol and drug use alone, but a decrease in the combined use of both substances, (2) a substantial decrease in the dropout rate and in the number of youth reported as having poor grades and/or behavior problems at school, and (3) a significant number of participants having no further involvement with the criminal justice system.

MICHIGAN

PROJECT TITLE: Intensive Foster Care, Alpena

SOURCES AND USES OF FUNDS:

The project began in October 1977 with formula funds and had received two formula grants. Project funds were used for personnel, supplies, and related expenses. The project's funding history follows.

	Award period		Total
	(10/77 thru 9/78)	(10/78 thru 9/79)	(note a)
Formula	$ 9,192	$23,574	$32,766
Local	1,021	0	1,021
Total	$10,213	$23,574	$33,787

a/Includes program funds only. $115,028 of funds needed to operate the foster homes were provided by courts or departments of social services.

PROJECT OBJECTIVES:

The primary service provided as a result of this project was placement of teenage youth with foster families to reduce the need for further court action or institutionalization. Project personnel recruited and trained foster home parents and provided a family counseling program to the youth's parents.

RESULTS AND OBSERVATIONS:

The project provided 19 foster homes, which had served as alternatives to institutionalization for 31 youths. The length of foster care for each youth ranged from about a month to over a year. The formula grants provided the startup funds needed for the project to become operational and self-sufficient. Other funding sources had been identified to continue the project.

MICHIGAN

PROJECT TITLE: County Shelter Home, Luce County

SOURCES AND USES OF FUNDS:

The project began in October 1977 with formula funds and had received two formula grants. Funds were used to provide child care services and were budgeted for contractual/professional services, travel, supplies, and operating expenses. The project's funding history follows.

	Award period		
	(10/77 thru 9/78)	(10/78 thru 9/79)	Total
Formula	$2,572	$10,091	$12,663
Local	286	0	286
Total	$2,858	$10,091	$12,949

PROJECT OBJECTIVES:

The primary service provided by the project was short-term shelter care for youth. The project provided a nonsecure shelter home for two youths for a maximum of 21 days. These youth were waiting for a more permanent placement by the probate court. The project director told us that the only alternative to the shelter home for three northern Michigan counties were their homes, foster homes, or jail.

RESULTS AND OBSERVATIONS:

The project had served 30 youths during the first 2 years in 4 different shelter homes. The project supervisor said the turnover in homes was high because the shelter home parents could not handle the strain. The 30 youths appeared to need the service provided. However, youth could not be served during the times between the closing of one home and the opening of the next.

MICHIGAN

PROJECT TITLE: Diversion Unit, Delta County

SOURCES AND USES OF FUNDS:

The project began in October 1977 with formula funds and had received two formula grants. Project funds were used to pay the salaries of a full-time counselor and a part-time caseworker and for supplies and related expenses. The project's funding history follows.

	Award period		
	(10/77 thru 9/78)	(10/78 thru 9/79)	Total
Formula	$24,871	$32,517	$57,388
Local	2,764	0	2,764
Total	$27,635	$32,517	$60,152

PROJECT OBJECTIVES:

The primary service provided was counseling teenage youth to divert them from probate court or to prevent them from further involvement with the probate court.

RESULTS AND OBSERVATIONS:

During the first 2 project years, 262 youths received counseling while being diverted from probate court. Based on the number of youth served, there appeared to be a need for the services provided by the project. The project director expected to receive an additional formula grant only for the period October 1979 through March 1980. He said that the project would be continued at about 50 percent of its current level after March 1980 because of a shortage of local funding. He said that after the formula funds were stopped, there would probably be youth needing help who would not receive it.

MICHIGAN

PROJECT TITLE: Status Diversion Group Home, Kalamazoo County

SOURCES AND USES OF FUNDS:

The project started with formula funds in 1977 using facilities that had been operated previously as a drug/alcohol abuse center. Formula funds were used for personnel, consultants, and related expenses. The project's funding history is shown below.

	Award period		
	(4/77 thru 9/78)	(10/78 thru 9/79)	Total
Formula	$71,707	$92,484	$164,191
Local match	7,968	0	7,968
Total	$79,675	$92,484	$172,159

PROJECT OBJECTIVES:

The goals of this project were to reduce female incarceration and return juveniles to their homes and communities. A needs assessment found that female status offenders lacked shelter and counseling services in the county. According to 1975 baseline data, 111 females were incarcerated and the probate court docket was bottlenecked due to the large numbers of status offenders. The project provided shelter and counseling services to female status offenders on a short-term basis. Eight girls and two houseparents lived in a large house, while two caseworkers and the project director provided therapy and counseling.

RESULTS AND OBSERVATIONS:

The project had served 226 female status offenders. Secure detention of status offenders in the county had been reduced by 78.4 percent; however, some of the reduction was attributed to a residential center for male status offenders and foster homes.

The project was delayed for 5 months after its award date. Despite this, the project had provided the intended services and met its goals. Formula funds ended on September 30, 1979; however, the project was continuing, using funds from two private, nonprofit foundations.

MICHIGAN

PROJECT TITLE: Status Offender Data Project, statewide

SOURCES AND USES OF FUNDS:

The project was funded in January 1978 with its first formula grant and had received a second formula grant. Project funds were spent for contractual services (mostly personnel and benefits), supplies, and related expenses. The project's funding history follows.

	Award period (1/78 thru 12/78)	Award period (4/79 thru 12/79)	Total
Formula	$68,087	$58,132	$126,219
Local	7,566	0	7,566
Total	$75,653	$58,132	$133,785

PROJECT OBJECTIVES:

The objective of this project was to determine, using 1975 data and 1978 criteria, how many juvenile status offenders were held in secure detention in Michigan. The project was initiated to determine if Michigan was in compliance with the requirement that 75 percent of all status offenders be deinstitutionalized. To obtain the required baseline data as well as supporting documentation, site visits were made to 240 juvenile facilities. These facilities represented almost every juvenile-serving facility in Michigan. After the data was collected, it would be analyzed, coded, and computerized. A final report would then be prepared. The second grant was to develop a prototype system for collecting and processing uniform information on juveniles.

RESULTS AND OBSERVATIONS:

The formula funds were used to meet the project objectives. The data had been accumulated and verified. Project officials were in the process of entering data into the computer and analyzing that data. Work had also begun for the second grant.

MICHIGAN

PROJECT TITLE: Alternative Education, Coopersville

SOURCES AND USES OF FUNDS:

The project began in 1976 when the Coopersville School District received a State grant of $5,000 for planning purposes. The project had received two subsequent formula grants. Project funds were used for personnel, equipment, and supplies. The project's funding history for the formula grant periods follows.

	Award period		
	(7/77 thru 9/78)	(10/78 thru 12/79)	Total
Formula	$35,271	$46,375	a/$81,646

a/Project costs do not include two staff positions funded with CETA funds.

PROJECT OBJECTIVES:

The basic thrust of the project was to keep students in school, thereby helping to keep them out of trouble. Because many area students had unstable life situations, the project emphasized improving student attitudes toward authority and responsibility. Prior to the formula funding, virtually all students in the alternative program were involved in juvenile offenses. This project expanded the alternative education program to a full year school program that served students who had already dropped out of school or who were identified as potential dropouts. In this project, students received individualized instruction and assistance from two teachers in areas such as reading and math. They also worked on increasing attendance, increasing self-concept, and establishing bonds between the individual students and the agencies in their lives, such as schools and employers. The instructors also provided counseling services whenever students sought it.

RESULTS AND OBSERVATIONS:

This project provided the intended services and was meeting its goals. It had served 112 students since 1976, 11 of whom graduated from high school. Several factors indicated the project's success--a reduction in project students held in jail or detention, a reduction of project students involved with local police, and a reduction in the school district's dropout rate from 5.3 percent in 1976 to 1.97 percent in 1979.

MICHIGAN

PROJECT TITLE: Culture and Recreation, Detroit

SOURCES AND USES OF FUNDS:

The project was funded as part of the Comprehensive Youth Training and Community Involvement Program (see p. 76) until it received its own formula grant. Project funds were budgeted for contractual services, personnel, supplies, and related expenses. Funds were spent for hourly wages of instructors and coaches, recreational equipment, and field trips to cultural and sports events. The amount of the project's only formula grant is shown below.

	Award period (4/79 thru 12/79)
Formula	$200,000

PROJECT OBJECTIVES:

The project's services and programs were designed for youth and their parents. The project attempted to reach low-income families, unemployed youth, and school dropouts by sponsoring activities that deter youth from delinquent and criminal behavior.

RESULTS AND OBSERVATIONS:

As of August 1979, the project had expended only $41,000 of the $200,000 grant. Because the grant period ran from April 1, 1979, through December 31, 1979, the State Office of Administrative Services had recommended that some of the $200,000 be deobligated.

The project provided the intended services. A visit to two of the agencies providing services under the grant showed that the agencies provided a variety of services to youth, including sports (boxing, baseball, basketball, and others) and cultural activities (arts and crafts, music, and dance.)

MICHIGAN

PROJECT TITLE: Community Care, Marquette County

SOURCES AND USES OF FUNDS:

The project began with formula funds and had received one formula grant. Formula funds were used for the project coordinator's salary and fringe benefits, supplies, a contract for program evaluation, and related expenses. The amount of the formula grant is shown below.

	Award period (10/78 thru 9/79)
Formula	a/$20,503

a/These funds were to coordinate a foster care program. State and local funds of $16,785 were used for the foster homes themselves but not as part of this project.

PROJECT OBJECTIVES:

This project was to provide a project coordinator to locate and recruit foster homes and train foster parents who would accept youth with emotional, family, or legal problems. Because it was difficult to find foster homes that would accept these types of youth prior to the project, the Probate Court Judge often had only two alternatives: send the youth back to his own troubled home or institutionalize the youth.

RESULTS AND OBSERVATIONS:

Two independent evaluations comparing the quantitative goals and objectives in the grant application with actual performance were conducted. The resulting reports indicated that the project generally met its goals and objectives.

We found that the project had operated as described in the grant application. The project was 1-1/2 months late in starting because the project coordinator did not start working until that time. During the remaining time, the project established 9 foster homes, trained 1 coordinator, and trained parents in 10 foster homes.

MICHIGAN

PROJECT TITLE: Comprehensive Youth Training and Community Involvement Program, Detroit

SOURCES AND USES OF FUNDS:

Some project services were provided before the subgrantee received formula funds. The project had received two formula grants. Project funds were used mostly for personnel, with smaller amounts budgeted for contractual services, supplies, and related expenses. The project's budgeted funding sources, during the time of its two formula grants, follow.

	Award period		
	(3/78 thru 3/79)	(4/79 thru 3/80)	Total
Formula	a/$224,190	$272,418	$ 496,608
HEW Title XX	194,665	280,000	474,665
CETA	221,857	400,000	621,857
State	7,120	0	7,120
Private	106,360	0	106,360
Total	$754,192	$952,418	$1,706,610

a/$2,226 of this amount was deobligated in July 1979.

PROJECT OBJECTIVES:

The project funded eight community-based organizations and three "drop-in centers" for teens. These facilities offered programs that provided counseling, education, cultural and recreational activities, advice about parental relationships, and vocational guidance. The project's goals were to prevent and reduce juvenile delinquency and to provide alternate activities for youth who were offenders or potential offenders. The project's specific goals included preventing and reducing juvenile delinquency in the city by 25 percent during 1979 and providing vocational counseling to 1,000 youths.

RESULTS AND OBSERVATIONS:

The project had difficulty hiring and retaining counselors because of low salaries. Despite this problem, 2,440 youths were counseled over a 1-year period, and the project provided the services called for in the grant contract. Due to poor recordkeeping by project officials, however, it was difficult to determine if specific project goals were met.

83

MICHIGAN

PROJECT TITLE: Diversion Services Program, State Department of Social Services

SOURCES AND USES OF FUNDS:

The project started in 1978 with formula funds and had received one formula grant. The Department of Social Services, the subgrantee, awarded two contracts in June 1979 to accomplish project objectives. One contract was for coordination and a needs assessment and the other was to provide technical assistance to local agencies. The amount of the project's formula grant and State match are shown below.

	Award period (7/78 thru 9/79)
Formula	$69,410
State	7,712
Total	$77,122

PROJECT OBJECTIVES:

Prior to awarding this grant, the State planning agency determined that the State needed an organization and plan to assist juvenile diversion programs with either technical assistance or coordination of services. The Department of Social Services was selected to receive this grant because it was experienced in operating shelter homes, programs to remove status offenders from the jurisdiction of juvenile courts, and programs to deinstitutionalize status offenders.

The coordination needs assessment contractor was to develop a State diversion plan by identifying existing services and number of clients, assessing these services, and determining the current need. The technical assistance contract agency was to develop short- and long-term solutions to problems of other service agencies.

RESULTS AND OBSERVATIONS:

Grant adjustments and startup delays caused a reduction of almost $36,000 from the original budget. However, the coordination and needs assessment contractor was developing the State diversion plan at the time of our visit. The technical assistance contractor had assisted 11 agencies by obtaining CETA funds, solving administrative problems, and addressing political problems.

MICHIGAN

PROJECT TITLE: Alternatives to Secure Detention, Ottawa County

SOURCES AND USES OF FUNDS:

The project began in January 1979 with a formula grant. Project funds were used for salaries, operation of a foster home, and related expenses. The grant amount and award period are shown below.

	Award period (1/79 thru 12/79)
Formula	$103,038

PROJECT OBJECTIVES:

To reduce the secure detention of status offenders, Ottawa County was awarded a grant through the State Department of Social Services to provide counseling services to juveniles and their families, recruit and license foster homes, provide training to foster parents, and provide information and referral services to youth. Prior to the project, Ottawa County had no alternative to secure detention of status offenders. A program coordinator, two caseworkers, and a clerk typist were hired with project funds.

RESULTS AND OBSERVATIONS:

As of August 1979, 665 youths had been referred to the project, 446 of whom needed and were provided counseling. Counseling consisted of 3 hours for the client, 3 hours for the parent, and 3 hours of combined counseling. In addition, 39 of the youths were placed in a foster home established by the project for shelter care. The foster home appeared to be neat, clean, and well organized.

MINNESOTA

PROJECT TITLE: Emergency Foster Homes, Lake and Cook County

SOURCES AND USES OF FUNDS:

This project, which was in its second year of operation, started with formula funds and had received two grants. Formula funds were budgeted for personnel, per diem to foster parents, and related expenses. Budgeted funds for the 2 years are shown in the following table.

	Award period		
	(10/77 thru 12/78)	(1/79 thru 12/79)	Total
Formula	$26,382	$30,755	$57,137
Local	2,931	3,417	6,348
Total	$29,313	$34,172	$63,485

PROJECT OBJECTIVES:

This project was to provide emergency shelter and services to status offenders as an alternative to secure detention. The services were to include food, clothing, medical attention, and limited counseling if requested. Its objectives were to establish nine foster homes, train foster parents, and alert the public to the program.

RESULTS AND OBSERVATIONS:

According to the project coordinator, nine foster homes had been established and two more were being licensed. In addition, procedures were established and information provided to local authorities on the program. As of September 1979, 40 youths had been placed in foster homes since the program began.

After 1980, the project will not be eligible for formula funds. The project coordinator said she expected the project to continue, even though her position would be abolished.

MINNESOTA

PROJECT TITLE: Serious Juvenile Offenders, statewide

SOURCES AND USES OF FUNDS:

This project, which was in its second year, started with formula funds and had received two grants. Formula funds were used for personnel, contracted services, and related expenses. Budgeted funds for the 2 years are shown in the following table.

	Award period		
	(12/77 thru 12/78)	(7/79 thru 6/80)	Total
Formula	$ 73,116	$130,000	$203,116
State	38,130	70,000	108,130
Total	$111,246	$200,000	$311,246

PROJECT OBJECTIVES:

This project was an experiment by the Minnesota Department of Corrections attempting to deal with the serious juvenile offender through the juvenile justice system. The alternative for these offenders was certification to stand trial as an adult. Crimes committed included murder, burglary, kidnapping, and robbery. The project was to determine whether treatment methods known to help less serious offenders could be applied to serious criminal offenders without jeopardizing public safety. The project goals were to reduce the frequency and seriousness of offenses, develop and coordinate a treatment program through existing programs, and provide an alternative to a separate maximum security facility for these youth. Youth participated from 14 months to 18 months.

The youth underwent a 14- to 30-day orientation phase in a secure section of the juvenile correctional facility where a contract was developed that the youth had to follow. The contract included vocational, educational, and work goals to be completed in the following residential restraint phase. During the residential restraint phase, which took 4 to 6 months, another contract was negotiated between the youth and his community. This contract had to include restitution for the crime committed. The final community surveillance phase, requiring 6 months or more, usually took place in the youth's community and included intensive supervision from community liaison workers. The project could also contract for other services for the youth.

RESULTS AND OBSERVATIONS:

As of September 1979, 55 of about 300 youths referred from the Courts and Department of Corrections had been accepted into the project. Three of the 55 were later removed by the Court. Of the 52 remaining, 42 were still in the program, 4 ran away, 3 were pending certification as an adult, 2 were in jail on a new offense, and 1 had completed the program. The first of these participants was not accepted until March 1978 and, because most participants were still in the program at the time of our audit, it was too early to determine the project's effectiveness.

MINNESOTA

PROJECT TITLE: Community Youth Program, Duluth

SOURCES AND USES OF FUNDS:

This project, which was in its fourth year of operation, started in an established juvenile center, received LEAA Part C funds in its second year, and had received formula grants for years three and four. Formula funds were used for personnel, supplies, and related expenses. Budgeted funds for years three and four are shown in the following table.

	Award period		
	(1/78 thru 12/78)	(1/79 thru 12/79)	Total
Formula	$61,762	$73,800	$135,562
Local	6,863	0	6,863
Total	$68,625	$73,800	$142,425

PROJECT OBJECTIVES:

This project was a nonsecure community-based day treatment program used as an alternative to institutionalization for criminal juvenile offenders. The primary goal was to avoid institutionalization for 80 percent of the participants. Services provided included individual, group, and family counseling, referrals to other programs, recreation, and school performance monitoring. Restitution was included in the youths' contracts with the project staff.

RESULTS AND OBSERVATIONS:

As of August 30, 1979, 137 youths had been referred to the program since it began in 1977. Sixteen were currently enrolled, 90 had successfully completed the program, and 31 were terminated before completion. Since July 1978, only 7 of 39 participants had been institutionalized within 6 months of successfully completing the program. The project was not eligible for LEAA funds after December 1979 and future funding was unclear. The local sponsoring agency agreed to fund it for 6 additional months. After that, the project may be incorporated into a new program.

MINNESOTA

PROJECT TITLE: Katahdin: A Workshop for Youth, Minneapolis

SOURCES AND USES OF FUNDS:

This project, which conducted research and planning for 1-1/2 years with private funds, had received formula funds for 2 years. Formula funds were used for personnel, transportation, and supplies. Budgeted funds for the grant years are shown in the following table.

	Award period		
	(2/78 thru 12/78)	(1/79 thru 12/79)	Total
Formula	$ 94,580	$118,334	$212,914
Private	10,500	5,000	15,500
Total	$105,080	$123,334	$228,414

PROJECT OBJECTIVES:

This project provided nonresidential day treatment to youth who had been adjudicated on at least three nonstatus offenses or failed in one residential placement. According to its Director, for many it was the final alternative to an institution. The project's overall objectives were to divert 70 percent of its clients from the justice system, upgrade the client's educational level, and improve the client's basic survival skills. The project was designed to provide 6 to 9 months of individualized, goal-oriented treatment to about 20 to 30 youths a year.

RESULTS AND OBSERVATIONS:

Between May 1978 and September 1979, the project accepted 31 of 107 youths referred. Of the youth accepted, four successfully completed the program, nine voluntarily left, three were removed by the court, and three were terminated by the program. Six of the 12 that were currently enrolled were to complete the program shortly after our visit. According to case files, 87 percent of the youth had been diverted from the justice system. Only two youths who had been in the program for at least 3 months, had petitions filed against them in juvenile court after leaving the project. In the 1979 spring semester, 8 students completed 46 academic credits, and in the 1979 summer semester, 11 students completed 52 credits.

MINNESOTA

PROJECT TITLE: Coalition for the Protection of Youth Rights, statewide

SOURCES AND USES OF FUNDS:

This project was in its first operating year and was started with formula and private funds. Formula funds were budgeted for the personnel costs of attorneys and other law firm employees and related expenses. Budgeted funding sources are shown in the following table.

	Award period		
	(10/78 thru 9/79)	(10/78 thru 9/79)	Total
Formula	$101,947	$176,350	$278,297
Private	63,030		63,030
Total	$341,327		$341,327

PROJECT OBJECTIVES:

This project was a coordinated effort by five nonprofit, legal assistance organizations to establish a children's advocacy program in Minnesota. Its services included free legal defense or representation on an individual or class basis in both civil and criminal matters. Project objectives were to provide quality legal assistance to children, participate in major juvenile impact cases, establish a clearinghouse for statewide dissemination of juvenile rights information, and establish an educational program for children's rights.

RESULTS AND OBSERVATIONS:

Project records showed that over 500 juveniles were represented between October 1978 and September 1979. In addition, project attorneys had been involved in seven cases involving significant legal issues of juvenile rights. The project took the lead role in implementing the State Indian Child Welfare Act, established a community education program, and developed a clearinghouse for distributing information. The project's financial reports on file at the State planning agency were not accurate. Indications were that expenses had been understated. This occurred because the project did not recruit an administrator for over 4 months and failed to design a system for uniform accounting and reporting of costs. The administrator instituted a uniform reporting format and, at the time of our visit, was reconstructing and correcting outlay reports to the State planning agency.

MINNESOTA

PROJECT TITLE: The Evergreen House, Bemidji

SOURCES AND USES OF FUNDS:

This project, which was in its third year of operation, started with an LEAA Part C grant and received two subsequent formula grants for years two and three. Formula funds were used for personnel, supplies, and related costs. Budgeted funding sources for years two and three are shown in the following table.

	Award period		
	(1/78 thru 12/78)	(1/79 thru 12/79)	Total
Formula	$41,606	$48,762	$ 90,368
Local	4,623	0	4,623
Project Income	0	15,000	15,000
Total (note a)	$46,229	$63,762	$109,991

a/CETA has provided over $25,000 for salaries since calendar year 1977.

PROJECT OBJECTIVES:

The project was a nonsecure, community-based house which provided shelter care and individual and family counseling to status offenders and dependent and neglected children in four counties and three Indian reservations. It was established to provide an alternative to secure detention. The overall objectives were to eliminate further contact with the juvenile justice system for half its clients, reduce secure detention of status offenders, and provide shelter service to children. In addition to shelter and counseling, the project was to act as a neutral advocate between youth and family and make referrals to other community services.

RESULTS AND OBSERVATIONS:

Since July 1977, 259 children had used the project. According to project files, only 13.7 percent had further contact with the juvenile justice system 6 months after leaving. The local judge and chief of police said that this project was the only alternative to secure detention in the area. A probation officer and welfare official said the program was effective, flexible, helpful, and staffed with excellent people. The formula funds were expected to stop this year. The project received $28,000 in private contributions, negotiated a $25,000 service contract with one county, and expected to raise its per diem charge to compensate for lost formula funds. However, continued operations appeared to hinge on negotiating contracts with other counties.

MINNESOTA

PROJECT TITLE: Juvenile Residential Treatment Center, St. Peter

SOURCES AND USES OF FUNDS:

This project was in its first operating year and started with formula funds. Formula funds were used for personnel, remodeling, and related expenses. Budgeted funding for the first year is shown below.

	Award period (11/78 thru 12/79)
Formula (note a)	$119,205

a/Sponsoring counties had to absorb some costs not provided for in the grant.

PROJECT OBJECTIVES:

The project was a nonsecure, community-based residential treatment center. It was an alternative to institutionalization for adjudicated male offenders. In 1980, the project planned to accept females and unadjudicated youth, including status offenders. The project provided food, shelter, recreation, and individual, group, and family counseling. The project was created to reduce the number of youth placed in faraway, costly State institutions and to increase community involvement in the treatment process. According to a county official, the State planning agency was reluctant to provide funds because the project was residential. As a result, the project had to agree not to seek continued funding. Project officials intended to use the formula funds to establish the center.

RESULTS AND OBSERVATIONS:

The center had been established and was operating. Project officials accepted their first referral in September 1979 even though the award period started in November 1978. Three more had been added at the time of our visit. The delayed startup was caused by community resistance and unexpected remodeling problems.

MINNESOTA

PROJECT TITLE: Prairie Home Youth Shelter, Braham

SOURCES AND USES OF FUNDS:

This project, which was in its third year of operation, was started with both formula and LEAA Part C grants. Two subsequent formula grants were received. Formula funds were used for personnel, supplies, and related expenses. Budgeted funding sources are shown in the following table.

	Award period			
	(1/77 thru 1/78)	(1/78 thru 12/78)	(1/79 thru 12/79)	Total
Formula	$39,978	$51,613	$64,156	$155,747
LEAA Part C	39,600	0	0	39,600
Local	8,842	5,735	0	14,577
Total (note a)	$88,420	$57,348	$64,156	$209,924

a/Project also had income of $1,150 in calendar year 1978.

PROJECT OBJECTIVES:

This project was a nonsecure, community-based shelter home for status offenders and dependent and neglected children. Its objectives included establishing an emergency shelter program, eliminating the detention of status offenders in five county jails, and assisting county courts and agencies in placing youth. It provided emergency food, shelter, supervision, and medical attention. In addition, the local school district provided a teacher for tutoring at no cost to the project. Funds were used for personnel, supplies, and related expenses.

RESULTS AND OBSERVATIONS:

The project had served 294 children through September 30, 1979. Only 25 of these had run away from the home, 3 of whom returned on their own accord. According to project progress reports and discussions with law enforcement authorities, status offenders were placed in shelters rather than jails. The project did not start until June 1977 because of community resistance. In 1980, the project expected to become self-sufficient because formula funds would stop. Three of the five participating counties were expected to continue the project through per diem payments, a fourth was undecided, and the fifth will withdraw.

OHIO

PROJECT TITLE: Youth Diversion Project, Cincinnati

SOURCES AND USES OF FUNDS:

This project began with formula funds, receiving two grants. Formula funds were used for personnel, renovation, supplies, and related expenses. The project's funding history is shown in the following table.

	Award period		
	(7/77 thru 6/78)	(7/78 thru 6/79)	Total
Formula	$16,200	$ 30,000	$ 46,200
Private	11,000	12,065	23,065
CETA	34,165	34,370	68,535
LEAA discretionary	0	50,000	50,000
Total	$61,365	$126,435	$187,800

PROJECT OBJECTIVES:

The project was a residential facility which also provided individual and family counseling and educational services to status offenders. It was a comunity-based alternative to court-administered social services which attempted to reduce the number of status offenders held in group homes and similar facilities.

RESULTS AND OBSERVATIONS:

The project officially began in July 1977 after formula funds were awarded; but due to problems with finding a suitable facility, juveniles were not served until January 1978, and the facility did not become residential until July 1979. Problems in finding a facility included community opposition and lack of suitable facilities in general. Problems in hiring staff also occurred.

The project was operating a five-day-a-week residential facility. As of June 30, 1979, 128 youths had been provided nonresidential services. Most of these were repeat status offenders who were facing the possibility of entering a secure facility.

OHIO

PROJECT TITLE: Project Intercept, Canton

SOURCES AND USES OF FUNDS:

This project was started with formula funds and received three grants. Formula funds were used for personnel, equipment, and supplies. Budgeted funding sources are shown in the following table.

	Award Period		
	(7/77 thru 6/78)	(7/78 thru 6/79)	Total
Formula	$30,000	$31,884	$61,884
Local	11,000	11,690	22,690
Total	$41,000	$43,574	$84,574

PROJECT OBJECTIVES:

The project's basic goal was to provide community-based alternatives to placing status offenders and delinquents in institutions. Specific project objectives were to divert youth from the juvenile justice system and detention and to reduce student truancy and dropouts. It provided individual counseling to the child and parents, shelter care, and an employment program.

RESULTS AND OBSERVATIONS:

All project activities had been terminated at the time of our visit because the State planning agency did not approve additional funding. The project was discontinued because it duplicated services provided by a project that served the city as well as the county. Intercept competed with the countywide project for participants. As a result, the project served only 78 children instead of an anticipated 726.

The former project director said that the project had (1) devised a special class on parenting skills, (2) led to a court order which forbids jailing status offenders, and (3) created a consistent citywide truancy policy. He said the countywide project currently used these accomplishments in some fashion.

OHIO

PROJECT TITLE: Diversion and Prevention Through Community Action, Cuyahoga County

SOURCES AND USES OF FUNDS:

This project, which started with LEAA Part C and local funds, received three formula grants for the following 16-month period. Formula funds were budgeted for personnel, consultants, and related expenses and for contracts with community-based agencies. Other funding was received during the 16-month grant period but was not included in the grant budget. The budgeted funding sources in the grant application are shown below.

	Award period (6/78 thru 9/79)
Formula	$353,432
Local	39,270
Total	$392,702

OBJECTIVES AND USES OF FUNDS:

The project provided a variety of nonresidential services to youth in 12 planning areas in the county. Cuyahoga County contracted with community-based agencies in the 12 planning areas to provide these services. Examples of services provided included a movie/lecture/discussion session, programs which provided counseling and referred youth to other agencies for assistance, and an alternative school for students who had not succeeded in a traditional school.

RESULTS AND OBSERVATIONS:

Large cash balances of formula and Part C funds were kept by both the regional planning unit and the county at the time of the audit. The regional planning unit maintained balances of $20,345 and $39,152 at the end of June and July 1979, respectively. The county had net monthend balances of $100,180, $78,998, $60,354, and $36,577 for the months of April through July 1979, respectively. Prior to these months, the monthend balances were low or more had been spent than reimbursed to the county and regional planning unit. Programs in 2 planning areas visited provided the intended services. A total of 18,461 youths were served by the overall project in its first 12 months of operation.

OHIO

PROJECT TITLE: Family Crisis Center Project, Summit County

SOURCES AND USES OF FUNDS:

This project started with formula funds and received three grants. Formula funds were used for personnel, shelter care, consultant fees, and equipment. Funding sources for the grant period are shown below.

	Award period (4/78 thru 2/10/80)
Formula	$120,336
Local	13,371
Total	$133,707

PROJECT OBJECTIVES:

Project objectives were to divert status offenders from the juvenile court and to keep children from being placed in residential shelter care. The project provided counseling to clients and family members and occasionally arranged residential care with a shelter home when needed to prevent a child from being placed in detention.

RESULTS AND OBSERVATIONS:

The project served 1,275 children during its first year and apparently provided the intended services. Two holding rooms observed at the project used to hold unruly children were small and made of cinder blocks with a concrete bench. There were no door handles or other means of opening the doors from the rooms' interior and locks were installed on the outside doors. The project director said these rooms had been used only two or three times and that no locks were on the doors when used.

Although cash balances were not maintained at the project, the regional planning unit held cash in an interest-bearing savings account. We could not determine the amount of formula funds in this account because they were intermingled with other LEAA funds. However, a regional planning unit official said that more than $30,000 in interest has been earned over a 5-year period. This interest had been used to buy U.S. Treasury notes and as match money for grants.

OHIO

PROJECT TITLE: Deinstitutionalization of Status Offenders and Unruly Treatment Project, Allen County

SOURCES AND USES OF FUNDS:

This project, which operated with local funding from September 1976 through May 1978, received three formula grants for an 18-month period. Formula funds were budgeted for personnel, consultants, supplies, and related expenses. Budgeted funding sources for the grant period are shown below.

	Award period (6/78 thru 11/79)
Formula	$100,000
Local	11,111
Total	$111,111

PROJECT OBJECTIVES:

The project provided individual and family counseling, drug therapy, and educational services to youths. Pre- and postadjudicated status offenders, nonoffenders, and "walk-ins" were served by the project. Project goals were to deinstitutionalize status offenders and to reduce probation officers' caseloads so they would have more time to spend with delinquent youth.

RESULTS AND OBSERVATIONS:

The project served 361 youths from June 1978 through May 1979 and provided services as intended in the grant application. Errors occurred in the project's bookkeeping--monthly financial reports contained erroneous data, and there was a difference of $664 between the project's records and the county's records. Because of these errors, we were unable to verify the uses made of project funds.

OHIO

PROJECT TITLE: Habilitation Facilitator Project, Tuscarawas County

SOURCES AND USES OF FUNDS:

This project started with formula funds and received three grants covering a 17-month period. Formula funds were budgeted for personnel, consultants' fees, travel, and supplies. The project's funding history is shown in the following table.

	Award period (8/78 thru 12/79)
Formula	$25,812
Local	2,868
Total	$28,680

PROJECT OBSERVATIONS:

The project had one employee--the facilitator--who served as the link between the youth, the court, the school, the community, and social service agencies which may help the status offender or delinquent. The goals were to coordinate and strengthen existing social and youth services and to develop new services. Other objectives were to reduce the rate of recidivism among status offenders and to reduce the number of institutionalized status offenders.

RESULTS AND OBSERVATIONS:

According to a June 1979 evaluation report, the project helped reduce the rates of recidivism for both status offenders and delinquents in the county by 27 percent and reduced the number of status offenders in secure detention in the county from 26 to 17. The project was expected to end at the close of the grant period (December 31, 1979). Because of an oversight, project officials did not apply for continued funding and the county did not have funds available for the project.

OHIO

PROJECT TITLE: Youth Extension Services, Preble County

SOURCES AND USES OF FUNDS:

This project was started with formula funds and was in its first 18-month period of operation. Formula funds were used for personnel, foster care, and related expenses. The project's funding history is shown below.

	Award period (6/78 thru 11/79)
Formula	$5,000
Local	556
Total	$5,556

PROJECT OBJECTIVES:

The project funded two types of volunteer programs in Preble County. The first type of program included crisis intervention and short-term foster care. Under this program, the project paid volunteers $4.00 per night to take care of youth while they were going through the judicial process. The second type of program was a nonresidential program which matched youth and adults on a one-to-one basis. These youth/adult pairs participated in project-sponsored activities (for example, lunches and short trips) and were free to meet at other times on their own. The project goals were to divert youth from the juvenile justice system and to prevent delinquency.

RESULTS AND OBSERVATIONS:

At the time of our visit, the project had served 28 youths, 10 of whom had received emergency foster care service. Some of those 10 had participated in the other programs as well. The project anticipated serving more youth, but the first project director, who was also a full-time probation officer, resigned before any volunteers or youth entered the program. The second project director, also a full-time probation officer, was unable at first, to devote much of her time to the project because of the need to learn her full-time duties.

A judge from the Preble County Court of Common Pleas, Juvenile Division, said that the program partially fills a very badly felt need. He also said that the emergency care funded by the project was very valuable and that the second project director felt the other services provided were very beneficial to the children.

OHIO

PROJECT TITLE: Project Home, Cincinnati

SOURCES AND USES OF FUNDS:

This project had operated, within a limited scope, with private and local government funds prior to receiving formula funds. Formula funds were budgeted for personnel expenses. Budgeted funding sources for the grant period are shown in the following table.

	Award period (4/78 thru 9/79)
Formula	$50,000
HEW Title XX	1,500
Agency sources	43,800
Total	$95,300

PROJECT OBJECTIVES:

The project's objective was to divert status offenders and delinquents from residential facilities by offering youth and family counseling, educational and psychological services, and recreational activities. Children who had been referred to the implementing agency for residential care, but for whom there was no available space, were provided these services. It was hoped that the services would enable these children to remain in their homes or substitute homes.

RESULTS AND OBSERVATIONS:

The status of 27 youths served from April 1978 to April 1979 showed that 9 were placed in residential care, 3 successfully completed the project and had no further need for the project's services, and 15 were still receiving the project's services.

OHIO

PROJECT TITLE: Stay Centers Project, Hamilton County

SOURCES AND USES OF FUNDS:

This project was started in 1976 with privately donated money and had received two subsequent formula and one special emphasis grant. Formula and special emphasis funds were spent for personnel and equipment. Budgeted funding sources for the grant period is shown below.

	Award period		
	(5/78 thru 6/78)	(4/78 thru 9/79)	Total
Formula	$13,800	$ 75,518	$ 89,318
Local	1,533	8,391	9,924
Special Emphasis (note a)	0	100,000	100,000
Total (note b)	$15,333	$183,909	$199,242

a/Awarded for the period 10/77 thru 9/79.

b/Placement agencies and the subgrantee also committed $334,567 to the project.

PROJECT OBJECTIVES:

This project provided separate, temporary residential facilities for male and female status offenders and delinquents who were awaiting residential placement or investigation by the court. In addition, the project provided formal and informal education and counseling.

RESULTS AND OBSERVATIONS:

The project provided the intended services to children, and according to a project evaluation report, generally operated above capacity. The project director indicated that the formula funds provided money for personnel costs which were not obtainable from private sources.

OHIO

PROJECT TITLE: Community Residential Alternatives Project for Status Offenders, statewide

SOURCES AND USES OF FUNDS:

This project was started with formula funds and received two grants, combined for an 18-month period. Formula funds were used for per diem payments to State-contracted group and foster homes throughout Ohio. The per diem payments covered the cost of a juvenile's food, shelter, counseling, and recreation. Costs for dental and medical care were paid with State funds. The project director said the State will assume all project costs when the grant period ends because of Ohio's deinstitutionalization needs and the success of this project.

	Award period (6/78 thru 11/79)
Formula	$295,920
State match	32,880
Total	$328,800

PROJECT OBJECTIVES:

This project was created to serve status offenders committed to the Ohio Youth Commission by county juvenile court judges. These status offenders were considered delinquent by Ohio State law because they violated the probation they received as a result of a status offense. The objective of this project was to deinstitutionalize these status offenders by providing them foster homes, group homes, and social services. The services included problem-oriented counseling, educational assistance, job-preparation counseling, and employment assistance.

RESULTS AND OBSERVATIONS:

As of June 30, 1979, 96 youths had been served by the project. Two of the group homes serving 12 youths appeared in good condition and suitable for project services.

OHIO

PROJECT TITLE: Child-Family Intervention Program, Ross County

SOURCES AND USES OF FUNDS:

This project was operated with Federal, State, local, and private funds by a mental health center prior to formula funding. Three formula grants were made to expand the project. Formula funds were budgeted for personnel, consultants, and related expenses. Budgeted funding for the expanded portion of the project, during the grant period, are shown below.

	Award period (6/78 thru 11/79)
Formula	$72,010
Agency match	9,307
Total	$81,317

PROJECT OBJECTIVES:

The project's goal was to provide an alternative to formal juvenile action in a five-county area by providing individual, family, and crisis intervention counseling. The project was intended to reduce status offenses by 15 percent. Any youth or parent was eligible for the services. The formula funds were used to increase the number of counselors from three to five so that full-time services could be provided to each county. In addition, a part-time secretary and child psychiatrist (consultant) were to be provided.

RESULTS AND OBSERVATIONS:

The objective of reducing status offenses by 15 percent in the five county area was exceeded. A total of 748 clients were counseled during the first year of operation. In addition, 126 parents were provided education classes. Most officials we interviewed said the parent education classes were effective and beneficial. A qualified child psychiatrist could not be located, however, who would work in the rural areas of the five counties.

OHIO

PROJECT TITLE: Interpersonal Process Recall, Franklin County

SOURCES AND USES OF FUNDS:

This project was started with formula funds in a private, nonprofit organization that had provided services to needy women since 1865. It received two formula grants for an 18-month period. Formula funds were used for personnel, equipment, and related costs. Budgeted funding sources are shown below.

	Award period (4/78 thru 9/79)
Formula	$73,763
Local share	8,196
Total	$81,959

PROJECT OBJECTIVES:

The project was to establish a 9-month experimental session for treatment of 32 youths, of whom half were in an experimental group and the others were in a control group. The control group received individual and group counseling, referral services, and attended classes at an alternative school. The experimental group received the same services as did the control group. In addition, youth in the experimental group and their families used a videotape to record and play back family counseling sessions. Other referrals to the implementing agency received counseling services but were not part of the experimental session. The goals of the project included reducing the school failure rate of juveniles and eventually sending the youth back to public schools.

RESULTS AND OBSERVATIONS:

Due to a delay in hiring staff and acquiring equipment, the first experimental and control groups received only partial treatment. At the time of our review, the project had served 85 youths and/or their families. The first groups receiving full treatment left the project during June and July 1979. Whether these children will be successful in future school work could not yet be determined. Early indications were that most of them will. The process of using videotape in the counseling process was supported by project officials who said it helped both the children and family realize their problems and forced them to be consistent in their comments.

TEXAS

PROJECT TITLE: Wilderness Challenge, Crockett State School

SOURCES AND USES OF FUNDS:

This project, which was in its second year of operation, started with LEAA Part C funds and had received one subsequent formula grant. Formula funds were used primarily for personnel costs and supplies. Budgeted funds for the second year are as follows.

	Award period (12/78 thru 11/79)
Formula	a/$204,050

a/The project's total operating cost was unknown because the Crockett School provided such assistance as administrative support, building space, two vehicles, and mechanic support that had not been quantified.

PROJECT OBJECTIVES:

Wilderness Challenge was an adventure-based educational/therapeutic program which consisted of a 26-day program involving a structured expedition in a remote wilderness area. The project attempted to divert new Texas Youth Council male wards, who were committed to State care for nonviolent crimes, from long-term institutionalization. The project operated one expedition each month except for December when the staff was on leave. The expeditions consisted of 3 staff accompanying 10 to 12 students on a 100- to 120-mile hike in 1 of 3 locations--Big Bend National Park in West Texas, Gila Wilderness in Southern New Mexico, and San Juan Mountains in Southern Colorado. During the expedition, problem solving skills were integrated with the dramatic experience of physical and psychological survival. The ultimate objective was to reorganize the meaning and direction of the juvenile's life.

RESULTS AND OBSERVATIONS:

Even though the project was included in the "Deinstitutionalization of Status Offenders" portion of the State plan, only 5 percent of its students were status offenders. During the first 2 years, through July 1979, 166 students participated in the program, with 154 graduating. Ninety-four percent of the graduates were successfully placed back in their communities.

Only 5 percent of the graduates had any contact with authorities during the first year after graduation. An evaluation report on the first project year stated that "Wilderness Challenge's performance after one full year of operation must be considered exemplary."

State officials believed that this project was the shortest and most economical program available for juveniles committed to State care. However, only those nonserious delinquent offenders with a home to return to were accepted, and the project's overall impact on participants was unknown. Potential criticisms are (1) the short duration of the program and (2) limited followup efforts. A Texas Youth Council official stated that research has shown that similar programs have considerably lowered recidivism 1 year after participation but have no effect on recidivism 5 years afterwards.

TEXAS

PROJECT TITLE: Metropolitan Youth Agency, Bexar County

SOURCES AND USES OF FUNDS:

This project, which was in its fourth year of operation, started with formula funds and received six grants. At the time of our visit, the project used about 25 percent of the formula funds for personnel and 75 percent for emergency shelter and residential services. Budgeted funds since project inception are shown in the following table.

	Award period				
	(2/76 thru 4/77)	(5/77 thru 4/78)	(5/78 thru 4/79)	(5/79 thru 9/79)	Total
Formula	$273,848	a/$512,142	$398,840	a/$ 60,818	$1,245,648
State	61,598	61,087	0	0	122,685
Local	0	0	45,530	91,226	136,756
Total	$335,446	$573,229	$444,370	$152,044	$1,505,089

a/Two grants.

PROJECT OBJECTIVES:

This project was to plan, coordinate, and contract for youth services rendered by various city and county organizations. The objectives were to divert status offenders from detention and provide help to troubled youth. The project personnel conducted studies to determine youth service needs and developed a plan to meet those needs. With this knowledge and plan, they purchased and monitored the required services. The types of services purchased included an emergency shelter care project, seven residential care projects, and three educational programs such as tutoring.

RESULTS AND OBSERVATIONS:

The project served several hundred children with the purchased services, but most contract services were curtailed because of decreased formula funding support. The residential and emergency shelter care programs, which averaged about 45 and 47 youths per day, respectively, in the fourth year, appeared to be successful in diverting youths from detention. The educational intervention program, however, failed to successfully return any of the juveniles to the public school system, absenteeism was high, and grade level increases were low. Of the seven residential emergency shelter care facilities visited, all but three were in fair or excellent condition. The other three needed improvements to the facilities.

At the time of our visit, the project's future was in a state of limbo. Project officials had been unable to obtain the required 60 percent match for the full fourth year's funding and had accepted two grants covering 5 months only. These grants ended on September 30, 1979. Shortly after these grants expired, however, the project obtained the required match for the remainder of the fourth year and the first 5 months of the fifth and final year of formula funding. With the termination of formula funding in 1980, the services provided by the project were expected to be curtailed or eliminated all together. The project had not identified funds to continue purchasing services at the time of our visit. As a result, the youth that would be provided residential care may suffer.

TEXAS

PROJECT TITLE: Juvenile Diversion and Delinquency Prevention Services, Bowie County

SOURCES AND USES OF FUNDS:

This project, which was in its second year of operation, started with formula funds and had received three grants. Formula funds were used for personnel, contracts, travel, and related expenses. The project's funding history is shown in the following table.

	Award period		
	(2/77 thru 1/79)	(2/79 thru 1/80)	Total
Formula	$13,584	a/$28,314	$41,898
Local	1,513	3,673	5,186
Total	$15,097	$31,987	$47,084

a/Two grants.

PROJECT OBJECTIVES:

This project was to divert status offenders and non-offenders from detention while providing various services to prevent them from becoming delinquent. These services included foster home care, psychiatric evaluations, private institutional care, and medical treatments. The objectives included increasing contacts with client referral agencies, establishing citizen volunteer guidance and counseling services, and reducing recidivism. This project essentially used one staff member, a probation officer, to provide project services.

RESULTS AND OBSERVATIONS:

During the first 6 months of the current probation year, 158 status offenders were referred to the project. Of those 158, 96 were released without being placed in detention and 20 were detained over 48 hours. A project staff member reported considerable progress toward developing the volunteer program and reasonable progress toward establishing foster homes, developing public awareness of services available, developing a regional emergency shelter, and establishing status offender files. The project only expended $5,150 during the first year for an average of $429 per month. The average monthly cash balance during this period was $2,107.

TEXAS

PROJECT TITLE: Project Intercept, Lubbock County

SOURCES AND USES OF FUNDS:

This project, which in its third operational year, began with formula funds and received three grants. Most (over 90 percent) of the formula funds used were for personnel costs. The project's budgets for each year are shown below.

	Award period			
	(5/77 thru 7/78)	(8/78 thru 7/79)	(8/79 thru 7/80)	Total
Formula	$ 81,779	$66,834	$50,000	$198,613
Local	19,014	30,291	47,219	96,524
Total	$100,793	$97,125	$97,219	$295,137

PROJECT OBJECTIVES:

This project was an alternative school where youth were placed who were too disruptive for normal classrooms. It was designed as a short-term program where students normally participate 7 or 8 weeks and are then returned to the normal classroom. The children were provided individualized assistance in 6 class periods, including 5 basic subjects and physical education.

RESULTS AND OBSERVATIONS:

County officials believed the project was highly successful at providing an alternative to expelling youth from school. During the first 2 years, 209 students participated in the project. The number returned to normal school was unknown for the first year, but 102 of 109 were returned in the second year with only 5 suspensions from the project. This project, in conjunction with a study hall project for less disruptive students, was credited with reducing school suspensions by 98 percent over the first 2 years.

TEXAS

PROJECT TITLE: Deinstitutionalization of Status Offenders, Young County

SOURCES AND USES OF FUNDS:

This project, now in its third year, began with formula funds and received three grants. Formula funds were used for foster home placement and psychological testing fees. The project's budgets for each year are shown in the following table.

	Award period			
	(5/77 to 4/78)	(5/78 thru 4/79)	(5/79 thru 4/80)	Total
Formula	$14,992	$2,400	$3,600	$20,992
Local	1,680	600	1,800	4,080
Total	$16,672	$3,000	$5,400	$25,072

PROJECT OBJECTIVES:

The project was developed to divert status offenders from the county jail while they await further disposition. The project director, a juvenile probation officer, was to find foster homes to provide emergency shelter for status offenders. The project was also to provide psychological testing for the status offenders in hopes of diagnosing and resolving the youth's problems. A psychologist was to administer the tests, evaluate the youth's I.Q. and character makeup, and provide a synopsis of the youth's physical and psychological flaws.

RESULTS AND OBSERVATIONS:

Although the grant was awarded in May 1977, the first youth was placed in a foster home in August 1977 and the first psychological tests were administered in January 1978. At the time of our visit in October 1979, the project had little resemblance to its goals and objectives. Foster homes did not exist and the last youth served left the program about a year before in November 1978. Additionally, when homes were used, they often provided long-term residential care instead of short-term emergency shelter. For example, two of the four youths placed in foster homes remained in their respective homes for 7 months and more. Only 9 youths of a projected 99 were given psychological testing, partially because the psychologist who administered the tests would travel to the project only if two or more youth were to be tested.

During the past year, 74 youths came into contact with the county probation office. None of them was provided emergency foster home shelter. They were either released or detained at the county jail to await further disposition. The district judge said juveniles can be held for up to 10 days before they have a hearing. At that time they are released, placed elsewhere, or detained 10 more days for another hearing. The probation officer said those detained last year were probably not suited for foster homes because of behavior problems. At the time of our visit, two youths were in jail; one had been there a week and the other for 3 weeks. County officials said these two youths were probably not suitable for foster homes.

TEXAS

PROJECT TITLE: Status/Juvenile Offender Diversionary Program, Ector County

SOURCES AND USES OF FUNDS:

This project, which was in its second year of operation, started with formula funds and received two grants. The implementing agency started in January 1975 with a grant from the Criminal Justice Division of the Governor's Office. Formula funds were used to pay for 20 months residential care by reserving four beds for juveniles in a home operated by a nonprofit organization. The amended budgeted funds for the 2 years are shown in the following table.

	Award period (note a)		
	(10/77 thru 9/78)	(10/78 thru 9/79)	Total
Formula	$13,068	$17,520	$30,588
Local	1,452	4,380	5,832
Total	$14,520	$21,900	$36,420

a/Final amendment changed award period and total budget. Original budget was for $52,594 and award period was 3 months earlier.

PROJECT OBJECTIVES:

The project was developed to provide status offenders an alternative to detention because no other residential facility existed in Ector County. To fill this gap in available services, a nonprofit organization agreed to open an eight-bed group home, provided that payment for half the bed space be guaranteed by Ector County Child Welfare and half by the Ector County Juvenile Probation Department. Both agencies agreed and the State planning agency received LEAA approval to pay for reserved bed space whether or not actually used.

RESULTS AND OBSERVATIONS:

Only 14 children were served over the 20 month project period for an average of 2.69 beds per day instead of the 4 reserved. As a result of this underutilization, the project expended about $11,925 for services not received. Project officials pointed out, however, that the project did make available an alternative to juvenile detention--an alternative that did not exist at the time of our visit. Even though the project was to continue with county funds after September 30, 1979, according to project officials, it was discontinued because of political circumstances. In addition, because the county decided not to seek any other Federal/State grants at that time, the project could not continue with these funds.

TEXAS

PROJECT TITLE: Diversion Impact Project, Harris County

SOURCES AND USES OF FUNDS:

This project, in its third year of operation, started with formula funds and received three grants. Formula funds were used for professional and contract services, supplies, and equipment. The project's funding history is shown in the following table.

	Award period			
	(9/77 thru 8/78)	(9/78 thru 8/79)	(9/79 thru 8/80)	Total
Formula	$292,909	$303,321	$180,513	$ 776,743
Local	164,734	a/ 74,811	120,484	360,029
Total	$457,643	$378,132	$300,997	$1,136,772

a/Includes $37,505 in-kind contribution.

PROJECT OBJECTIVES:

Originally, the project's goal was to divert status offenders from unnecessary entrance into or continuation in the juvenile justice system. At the time of our visit, the goal was to provide continuing professional help and alternative support services to status offenders and their families. During the first 2 grant years, the project was organized to provide family-oriented therapeutic intervention, telephone and mobile crisis counseling, temporary residential placement, training seminars and conferences, and mental health assessments.

The mobile crisis counseling and mental health components were not provided in the third year. Services were provided mainly through subcontracts with nonprofit organizations.

RESULTS AND OBSERVATIONS:

The project's residential group home was not operated during the third year grant although it was originally budgeted. At the time of the grant application, it was envisioned that this function would be provided by contract with the same nonprofit organization that provided this service in the first 2 years. However, because of past difficulties in receiving timely approval of contracts and reimbursement, the organization decided not to seek a contract for the third year. The other services were provided.

The therapeutic intervention program provided counseling to parents and juveniles in an attempt to change behavior of adolescents. According to progress reports, 739 status offenders were diverted through the family services and 1,799 crisis calls were received during the first project year. The project had excessive grant funds on hand at various times. For example, about $100,000 of grant monies were on hand at the end of January 1979, and about $86,000 at the end of February 1979, while the average monthly expenditures were only $18,458 over the second grant year.

TEXAS

PROJECT TITLE: Status Offender Center, Dallas County

SOURCES AND USES OF FUNDS:

This project, which was in its third year of operation, started with formula funds and received five grants. Formula funds were used for salaries and purchase of services. The project's funding history is shown in the following table.

	Award period			
	(5/77 thru 9/78)	(10/78 thru 9/79)	(10/79 thru 9/80)	Total
Formula	$666,944	$553,789	$452,436	$1,673,169
Matching funds	0	90,876	301,218	392,094
Total	$666,944	$644,665	$753,654	$2,065,263

PROJECT OBJECTIVES:

This project provided several services, with primary emphasis on emergency shelter and an alternative education program. Other services included a subcontracted counseling program and a therapeutic camping program. The emergency shelter did not operate until the second year.

RESULTS AND OBSERVATIONS:

We could not determine the total number of children served because some were just counseled and sent home, with no records kept. However, the project had provided specialized services to 709 youths--52 percent of these received emergency shelter and 26 percent participated in the alternative education program. While many juveniles were diverted from the judicial system, overall success of the project was not known because it had not operated long enough to fully determine its impact on the community.

The project, which was initially awarded grants for 3 years of operation, did not use $379,475 (57 percent) of the first grant, primarily because the emergency residential shelter did not materialize until the second year. When the shelter opened, however, a separate grant was obtained for its operations. Consequently, the project operated with two concurrent grants and the combined grant award for emergency residential services was in excess of requirements for years two and three by $96,000 and $97,000, respectively. Cash balances of $28,000 for the first grant and over $140,000 for the second grant period were maintained at the county level because the Dallas Independent School District's billing procedures had not been timely.

TEXAS

PROJECT TITLE: Career Opportunities Program (Career Planning Academy), Tarrant County

SOURCES AND USES OF FUNDS:

This project, in its third year of operation, started with formula funds and received three grants. Formula funds were used for personnel, professional and contract services, and related expenses. The project's funding history is shown in the following table.

	Award period (school year)			
	(1977 - 1978)	(1978 - 1979)	(1979 - 1980)	Total
Formula	$192,134	$189,257	$183,443	$564,834
Local	29,858	75,217	118,729	223,804
Total	$221,992	$264,474	$302,172	$788,638

PROJECT OBJECTIVES:

The objective of the project was to provide an alternative education to youth who were unable or unwilling to comply with traditional methods. The school's program included academic studies, career guidance, and career development.

RESULTS AND OBSERVATIONS:

A study made by the psychology department of a university concluded that participation in this project resulted in significantly fewer recorded juvenile offenses and in significantly better school attendance. The project served 470 students during its first 2 years. Local officials, educators, and students overwhelmingly supported the project.

TEXAS

PROJECT TITLE: Center for Juvenile Delinquency Prevention, Southwest Texas State University

SOURCES AND USES OF FUNDS:

This project, in its second year of funding, started with formula funds and received two grants. Formula funds were used for salaries, professional services, and related expenses. The project's funding history is shown in the following table.

	Award period		
	(5/78 thru 4/79)	(5/79 thru 4/80)	Total
Formula	$227,937	$195,316	$423,253
Subgrantee	25,834	25,796	51,630
Total	$253,771	$221,112	$474,883

PROJECT OBJECTIVES:

Project objectives were to train law enforcement officers, school personnel, and private citizens in juvenile delinquency-related courses and to develop a juvenile justice library. For training, the project relied heavily on lecturers, consultants, and research analysts as well as project staff.

RESULTS AND OBSERVATIONS:

The entire first year grant award was disbursed to the project, but only $147,502 was spent and, as of July 31, 1979, only $15,698 was encumbered. This left a cash balance of over $57,000 for which the project had no planned use. We pointed this out to State officials who subsequently recovered all the funds. Most of the balance resulted apparently from overestimating the number of persons to be trained in the first year. Over 500 persons were expected for the first year, but only about 250 attended. For the second year, project officials said, people were turned away because the summer courses were full. The officials said they expect to exceed the enrollment goals in the second year.

At the time of our review, the library included books and materials used for classroom instruction. In addition, four juvenile delinquency-related booklets were developed and eight public service announcements dealing with school crime and status offenders were being produced.

TEXAS

PROJECT TITLE: Status Offender Shelter Homes, El Paso County

SOURCES AND USES OF FUNDS:

This project, which ceased operations in September 1979, was started with formula funds and received three grants. Formula funds were used for salaries, professional and contract services, and travel. The project's funding history is shown in the following table.

	Award period			
	(10/76 thru 9/77)	(10/77 thru 9/78)	(11/78 thru 9/79)	Total
Formula	a/$40,715	$39,870	$38,301	$118,886
Local	0	7,404	10,604	18,008
Total	$40,715	$47,274	$48,905	$136,894

a/Only $13,032 was spent.

PROJECT OBJECTIVES:

This project was comprised of a system of foster homes which provided up to 1 year of care for status offenders. During the placement period, caseworkers counseled both the youth and family, attempting to restore family ties. Project officials screened families who volunteered to become foster families and conducted unannounced safety and sanitary inspections. Foster parents were trained in parental skills, first aid, and emergency treatment.

RESULTS AND OBSERVATIONS:

The project ended in September 1979 because the county did not take over funding. Project officials said the range of their public and private juvenile programs in the area met local needs. During the first year, foster parents were recruited and trained, resulting in 13 homes ready for placement, of which 10 were in operation. Statistics for the second year showed that 31 children were served for an average stay of 112 days. Of 16 youths discharged during the year, only 1 had since been institutionalized. Statistics were not available for the third and final year. Project officials said that all the children were discharged to their homes or another program.

TEXAS

PROJECT TITLE: Bryant House, Travis County

SOURCES AND USES OF FUNDS:

This project, which was in its fourth year of operation, started with LEAA Part C funds and had received three subsequent formula grants. Formula funds were used exclusively for personnel costs the past 2 years. Budgeted funds for years two, three, and four are shown in the following table.

	Award period			
	(11/76 thru 10/77)	(11/77 thru 10/78)	(11/78 thru 10/79)	Total
Formula	$ 98,984	$ 82,162	$ 54,774	$235,920
State/Local (note a)	32,400	51,479	82,220	166,099
Total	$131,384	$133,641	$136,994	$402,019

a/Primarily placement fees from Probation Court or Texas Youth Council, the State agency responsible for youth committed to State care.

PROJECT OBJECTIVES:

The project was a halfway house whose primary objective was to provide residential services for male status and delinquent offenders. While in residence, each boy was offered an individualized treatment plan consisting of counseling and problem-solving skills and educational and vocational alternatives. The residents were usually diverted from a State institution or prepared for community living after being in an institution. They were required to attend public school, obtain vocational training, or be employed.

RESULTS AND OBSERVATIONS:

The project served approximately 85 children, through the end of August 1979. The normal length of stay was 4 to 6 months. During the first 3 years, 56 percent of those leaving the project were placed with family or in individual living, 34 percent went elsewhere (normally the Texas Youth Council), and 10 percent ran away. According to the project director, 50 to 60 percent of those leaving had no further contact with law enforcement officials within 6 months following discharge.

The project house was a leased building in one of the highest crime areas in the city. The building appeared old and rundown. The project director said that a better building had to be found if the project continued. Future funding was uncertain because formula grants will end in October 1980. After that, the project will have to rely on private donations or county support, neither of which was certain, to supplement placement fees. Project officials said it takes 2 or 3 years to start a halfway house and the State continuation policy caused hardships because project funding is phased out after 5 years. This caused project staff to be split between project purposes and fund-raising.

TEXAS

PROJECT TITLE: Status Offender Family Counseling and Crisis Intervention, Nueces County

SOURCES AND USES OF FUNDS:

This project, which was in its second year of operation, started with LEAA Part C funds and received one subsequent formula grant. Formula funds were used for personnel costs. Budgeted costs for the second year are shown in the following table.

	Award period (3/79 thru 2/80)
Formula	$39,357
Local	9,839
Total	a/$49,196

a/This represents one-third of the implementing agency's total operating budget. United Way supplied 43 percent of the funding and counseling fees charged clients provided 18 percent.

PROJECT OBJECTIVES:

The project's purpose was to divert youths from the court system by counseling prestatus and status offenders and their families. This counseling was provided by a private United Way agency. Focusing on the family unit as a whole, the project tried to establish better communication and listening skills among family members to enhance the juvenile's ability to cope with problems in his/her own environment. The program was structured to last 10 sessions with each session lasting about 1 hour.

RESULTS AND OBSERVATIONS:

Since the project's inception in March 1978, 212 youths and their families had entered the program. However, the project's success in diverting youth from the justice system was unknown. Many youth/families dropped out of the program after the initial session. As of September 1979, 173 cases were closed and 39 cases were active. The clients in over half of the closed cases had attended five sessions or less. Most clients were charged for the counseling services unbeknownst to State officials until our review. These officials subsequently stated that an onsite monitoring and technical assistance visit would be scheduled to review fees charged and their effect on participation in the counseling services.

TEXAS

PROJECT TITLE: Juvenile Group Home, Grayson County

SOURCES AND USES OF FUNDS:

This project, scheduled to begin serving youth in November 1979, was to initiate operations with formula funds. The project had strong local support which had already funded the purchase and renovation of a two-story brick structure. Once operating, additional funds would come from a $20 per day per youth placement fee paid by referring agencies. The project's projected first-year budget is shown in the following table. Formula funds were to be primarily used for personnel costs.

	Award period (6/79 thru 5/80)
Formula	$65,000
Matching funds	7,736
Total	$72,736

PROJECT OBJECTIVES:

This project was a 13-bed emergency shelter facility that expected to begin operation in November 1979 (after our visit). It would be the first facility of its kind in Grayson County and would provide boys and girls an alternative to jail or going back to undesirable home environments. A youth's maximum stay in the shelter would be 30 days but an average stay of 5 to 6 days was anticipated. In addition to short-term living quarters, family counseling and medical/psychological evaluations were to be provided.

RESULTS AND OBSERVATIONS:

At the time of our visit, the home appeared to be ready to serve children in the near future. The only problem noted was that project officials were confused about grant requirements due to a lack of communication with State officials. A State planning agency official said that technical assistance would be provided.

TEXAS

PROJECT TITLE: Alternative High School for Juveniles, Marshall County

SOURCES AND USES OF FUNDS:

This project was started in 1976 under the Texas Center for Volunteer Action and received two formula grants beginning in August 1978. Formula funds were used for salaries, travel, supplies, and equipment. Budgeted funding for the grant periods is shown in the following table.

	Award period		
	(8/78 thru 6/79)	(8/79 thru 6/80)	Total
Formula	$47,056	$49,755	$ 96,811
Local school district	12,322	12,270	24,592
Total	$59,378	$62,025	$121,403

PROJECT OBJECTIVES:

This project served students who could not function in a regular classroom. The goals included instruction in math, reading, and communication; preparation for entry into the job market or re-entry into high school; and improving peer relationships, positive self-concept, and motivation to become productive citizens. Students attended class for 3-1/2 hours a day in the morning and held jobs in the afternoon. Unemployed students returned in the afternoon to continue studies. After testing, the teachers designed an individualized course of study for each student. Project staff consisted of a principal, two teachers, an aide, and a counselor.

RESULTS AND OBSERVATIONS:

During the 1978-79 school year, 41 students attended. At the beginning of the year, only 13 percent scored on or above their desired ability levels in an achievement test. At the end of the year, 63 percent scored on or above their desired levels. In addition to academic progress, school officials monitored and documented student behavior patterns. Our review of these documents showed that nearly every student's behavior improved. Probably the most noteworthy project achievement was the graduation of 16 of 17 students who took the General Educational Development exam.

Funds were reimbursed to the project through the Texas Youth Council (TYC), a State agency. As of September 30, 1979, the project had submitted claims for $42,836 in expenditures but received only $29,397. We pursued this further and developed the following timetable.

Funds disbursed to TYC		Funds received by project	
Date	Amount	Date	Amount
4/12/79	$29,900	6/20/79	$29,397
6/18/79	14,500		
Total	$44,400		$29,397

TYC officials said an internal communications breakdown had occurred between the TYC project coordinator and their internal audit group and assured us the funds would be released as soon as an expected positive audit report was received.

The success of this project resulted in the State changing its policy so that school districts can become subgrantees for alternate school projects. The State planning agency plans to use some of its uncommitted formula funds for these type projects.

TEXAS

PROJECT TITLE: Youth Diversion Program, Hidalgo County

SOURCES AND USES OF FUNDS:

Portions of this project were initiated with formula funds, and four grants were received. The implementing agency had been providing services through youth centers for the past 10 years. Over 90 percent of the formula funds were used for personnel-related costs. The project's budgets relating to these funds are shown in the following table. Additional funds, amounting to about $697,682 from other Federal agencies, revenue sharing, State and local agencies, and private donations were received by the implementing agency from January 1975 through September 1979.

	Award period			
	(5/77 thru 4/78)	(5/78 thru 4/79)	(5/79 thru 4/80)	Total
Formula	$55,706	$55,771	$115,412	$226,889
Matching funds	6,194	6,971	20,914	34,079
Total	$61,900	$62,742	$136,326	$260,968

PROJECT OBJECTIVES:

This project essentially provided financial assistance to continue services that have been provided in youth centers throughout Hidalgo County for years. These services included counseling, recreation, employment placement assistance, career help, and tutoring. These services did not change when the formula grant was awarded, but two services were added--(1) foster care services and (2) an employment and referral program to provide youth jobs when they could not qualify for CETA employment.

RESULTS AND OBSERVATIONS:

During the 2-1/4 years of project funding, the implementing agency had accepted 870 referrals and provided them various services. For example, 45 youth were placed in foster homes and 19 youths had received jobs under the employment and referral program.

At the time of our visit, there was little activity at most of the eight youth centers. Facilities ranged from poor to excellent condition, and some centers had a good supply of recreation equipment while others had none. Additionally, the project's financial management and formula fund accountability was complex, and the county did not account for match requirements. The various project resources were juggled among 14 different bank accounts.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20530

Address Reply to the
Division Indicated
and Refer to Initials and Number

FEB 27 1980

Mr. Allen R. Voss
Director
General Accounting Office
United States General Accounting Office
Washington, D.C. 20548

Dear Mr. Voss:

This is in response to your request to the Attorney General for the comments of the Department of Justice (Department) on your draft report entitled "States Use Federal Juvenile Justice Funds In Accordance With Established Purposes."

We are in general agreement with the draft report's findings and recommendations. The report does point out several problems that are of concern to us, and the comments which follow address these problems.

The report recommends that the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (LEAA) ". . . provide more comprehensive information on the status of juvenile justice funds in the States when recommending future funding levels for the program. . . ." At the present time, the LEAA financial reporting system only requires that states supply information to LEAA on the amounts of obligations and expenditures of formula grant funds.

The Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) has been acutely aware that the financial information provided under the present system is inadequate and has taken several steps to collect more current and pertinent information on the status of funds. The Formula Grant Staff of OJJDP has requested a verbal report from the states covering obligations, expenditures, and commitments. Information is being obtained in this manner because LEAA has not been able to mandate a formal reporting system. In addition to the above, OJJDP has entered into negotiations with the National Criminal Justice Association to promulgate directives to the states, stressing the need for and timely development of more comprehensive management data on the status of formula grant funds. Finally, in an effort to establish a more formal reporting system, OJJDP will begin negotiations with the Office of Justice Assistance Research and Statistics for the design of a system which captures obligations, expenditures, and commitments of formula grant awards to the states.

The GAO states that they made onsite visits to 80 projects. Of the 80 projects, all but three appeared to be operating generally as described in the grant application. All but two of the 80 projects had properly accounted for grant funds and used them for approved purposes. Although excessive cash balances were not maintained at the state level, and it was not generally a major problem at the regional or project level, GAO did note excessive cash balances at five projects and regional planning units in Ohio and Texas.

The OJJDP will institute immediate corrective action to resolve these problems. The individual projects and states cited in the report will be contacted and requested to review their cash positions, make necessary adjustments, and provide written documentation to this office attesting that specific corrective action has been taken. In addition to the above, and as a part of their ongoing responsibility, the appropriate Formula Grant Staff person will make onsite visits to ensure that the specific projects have taken appropriate remedial action.

We appreciate the opportunity to comment on the report. Should you desire any additional information, please feel free to contact us.

Sincerely,

Kevin D. Rooney

Kevin D. Rooney
Assistant Attorney General
for Administration

(185940)

*U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE : 1980 O-620-386/92

Single copies of GAO reports are available free of charge. Requests (except by Members of Congress) for additional quantities should be accompanied by payment of $1.00 per copy.

Requests for single copies (without charge) should be sent to:

U.S. General Accounting Office
Distribution Section, Room 1518
441 G Street, NW.
Washington, DC 20548

Requests for multiple copies should be sent with checks or money orders to:

U.S. General Accounting Office
Distribution Section
P.O. Box 1020
Washington, DC 20013

Checks or money orders should be made payable to the U.S. General Accounting Office. NOTE: Stamps or Superintendent of Documents coupons will not be accepted.

PLEASE DO NOT SEND CASH

To expedite filling your order, use the report number and date in the lower right corner of the front cover.

GAO reports are now available on microfiche. If such copies will meet your needs, be sure to specify that you want microfiche copies.